

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

### BOARD MEETING NOTICE

Meeting No. 193

**DATE:** Thursday, August 9, 2007

**TIME:** 7:00 P.M. Board Meeting

**PLACE:** San Mateo County Transit District Office  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium  
San Carlos, CA

**PARKING:** Available adjacent to and behind building.  
Please note the underground parking garage is no longer open.

**PUBLIC TRANSIT:** SamTrans Bus: Lines 261, 295, 297, 390, 391, 397, PX, KX.  
CalTrain: San Carlos Station

\*\*\*\*\*

1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ ROLL CALL

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA  
*Note: Public comment is limited to two minutes per speaker.*

3.0 ANNOUNCEMENTS/ PRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 Receive presentation from Bill Dodd, Chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and share with Bill Dodd issues of mutual concerns between C/CAG and MTC.

p. 1

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA

*Consent Agenda items are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless members of the Board, staff or public request specific items to be removed for separate action.*

- 4.1 Review and approval of the Minutes of Regular Business Meeting No. 191 and Special Business Meeting No. 192 dated June 14, 2007. ACTION p. 3
- 4.2 Review and approval of Resolution 07-22 for application to designate the El Camino Real corridor in San Mateo County as a Priority Development Area (PDA). ACTION p. 11

- 4.3 Review and accept the status update on the C/CAG 3rd Cycle Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Incentive Program. ACTION p. 19
- 4.4 Review and Approval of Resolution 07-21, Authorizing the C/CAG Chair to Execute an Amendment to the Eisenberg, Olivieri, and Associates, Inc. (EOA) Contract in the Amount of \$62,000 for Managing the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program's "Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project" as a Programmatic AB1546 Project. ACTION p. 23
- 4.5 Review and approval of Resolution 07-23 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an agreement with SamTrans for \$100,000 to expand bus service in Pacifica. ACTION p. 31
- 4.6 Review and approval of a Recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of a Referral from the City of Redwood City, Re: A Proposed Zoning Amendment and Adoption of a Precise Plan for the Proposed Peninsula Park Mixed - Use Development on Bair Island Road Southeast of San Carlos Airport. ACTION p. 39
- 4.7 Review and approval of Resolution No. 07-24, Authorizing the C/CAG Chair to Negotiate and Execute an Agreement with Jacobs Consultancy to Provide Professional Consulting Services to Prepare an Update of the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (CLUP) for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport. ACTION p. 71
- 4.8 Review and approval of AB1546 Countywide Congestion Management Program for Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Projects. ACTION p. 77
- 4.9 Review and approval of Resolution 07-25 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amendment to the agreement for an amount not to exceed \$12,000 with Economic and Planning Systems for the completion of the Housing Needs Study. ACTION p. 85
- 4.10 Status report on the Implementation of the Hydrogen Shuttle. INFORMATION p. 91
- 4.11 Review and Accept C/CAG Legislative Update. ACTION p. 95  
(A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified.)
- 4.12 Review and approval of Resolution 07-26 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amended Fiscal Year 2007-08 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Expenditure Program (\$41,000) for the City of Menlo Park for local shuttle service. ACTION p. 117
- 4.13 Review and Approval of Appointments to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC). ACTION p. 121

*NOTE: All items on the Consent Agenda are approved/accepted by a majority vote. A request must be made at the beginning of the meeting to move any item from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.*

## 5.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.1 Receive presentation and comments on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Strategic Plan Process. ACTION p. 127
- 5.2 Review and approval of the 2007 congestion monitoring report and the Draft 2007 Congestion Management Program (CMP) and authorize distribution for comments. ACTION p. 129
- 5.3 Review and accept the Final Report on the San Mateo County Housing Needs Study. ACTION p. 133
- 5.4 Review and approval of Performance Review Forms for Executive Director. ACTION p. 135

## 6.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

### 6.1 Committee Reports (oral reports).

### 6.2 Chairperson's Report.

## 7.0 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

## 8.0 COMMUNICATIONS - Information Only

Copies of communications are included for C/CAG Board Members and Alternates only. To request a copy of the communications, contact Nancy Blair at 650 5991406 or [nblair@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:nblair@co.sanmateo.ca.us) or download a copy from C/CAG's website – [www.ccag.ca.gov](http://www.ccag.ca.gov).

- 8.1 Letter from Richard Napier, Executive Director C/CAG, to Senator Leland Yee, dated 6/12/07. Re: Letter of Support for SCA 12 (Yee and Torlakson) – Stormwater and Urban Runoff Service Fees. p. 145

- 8.2 Letter from Richard Napier, Executive Director C/CAG, to Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, State Capital Building, dated 6/22/07. Re: Letter of Support for SB 279 (Yee) – Sale of Vehicles on State Highways. p. 147

- 8.3 Letter from Deborah Gordon, C/CAG Chair, to Honorable Barbara Pierce, Mayor, City of Redwood City, dated 7/09/07. Re: Airport Land Use Commission (C/CAG Board) Action on a Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of a Referral from the City of Redwood City, Re: Proposed *Redwood City North Main Street Precise Plan* for an Area Near San Carlos Airport. p. 149

- 8.4 Letter from Deborah C. Gordon, C/CAG Chair, to Honorable Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor of California, dated 7/16/07. Re: Invitation to Event/ Press Briefing on Implementing the Hydrogen Highway in San Mateo County. p. 151

## 9.0 MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

## 10.0 ADJOURN

Next scheduled meeting: October 11, 2007 Regular Board Meeting.

**PUBLIC NOTICING:** All notices of C/CAG Board and Committee meetings will be posted at San Mateo County Transit District Office, 1250 San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA.

*NOTE: Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Nancy Blair at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.*

*If you have any questions about the C/CAG Board Agenda, please contact C/CAG Staff:*

*Executive Director: Richard Napier 650 599-1420    Administrative Assistant: Nancy Blair 650 599-1406*

## FUTURE MEETINGS

August 1, 2007	2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study TAC – <b>canceled.</b>
August 8, 2007	2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study PAC - <b>canceled.</b>
August 9, 2007	Legislative Committee - SamTrans 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium - 5:00 p.m.
August 9, 2007	C/CAG Board - SamTrans 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium - 7:00 p.m.
August 21, 2007	NPDES Technical Advisory Committee - TBD - 10:00 a.m.
August 16, 2007	CMP Technical Advisory Committee - SamTrans 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium
August 16, 2007	Utilities Working Group - 155 Bovet Rd., San Mateo - 2:45 p.m.
August 23, 2007	Airport Land Use Commission - Burlingame City Hall - Council Chambers
August 23, 2007	Bikeways and Pedestrian Advisory Committee - San Mateo City Hall - 4:00 p.m. Conference Room C - 7:30 p.m.
August 27, 2007	CMEQ Committee - San Mateo City Hall - Conference Room C - 3:00 p.m.
Sept. 4, 2007	Administrators' Advisory Committee - 555 County Center, 5 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Redwood City - Noon

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors

**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director

**Subject:** RECEIVE PRESENTATION FROM BILL DODD, CHAIRMAN OF THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC), AND SHARE WITH BILL DODD ISSUES OF MUTUAL CONCERNS BETWEEN C/CAG AND MTC

(For further information or questions contact Richard Napier at 599-1420 or Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Board receive a presentation from Bill Dodd, Chairman of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and share with Bill Dodd issues of mutual concerns between C/CAG and MTC.

Further, that the C/CAG board urge MTC to adopt a policy to establish reasonable balance between county and regional discretionary funds in the allocation of Federal funding and to use said policy to guide the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

None.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

### **Overview of MTC**

Created by the state Legislature in 1970, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. The Commission's work is guided by a 19-member policy board, appointed directly by local elected officials as well as members represent the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) plus nonvoting members representing federal and state transportation agencies and the federal housing department. Carrying out the Commission's directives is a staff of over 130 persons headquartered in Oakland.

### **ITEM 3.1**

MTC is responsible for regularly updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a comprehensive blueprint for the development of mass transit, highway, airport, seaport, railroad, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The Commission also screens requests from local agencies for state

and federal grants for transportation projects to determine their compatibility with the plan. MTC is empowered by the Federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA) to determine the mix of transportation projects best suited to meet the region's needs, to help set priorities for the hundreds of millions of dollars flowing each year to the Bay Area from flexible federal funding programs.

Using these federal dollars, MTC has established and administered and/or oversaw several regional grant programs. Examples include:

- Regional Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program.
- Regional Housing Incentive Program (HIP) promotes the building of compact housing in the vicinity of public transit hubs.
- The Lifeline Program that funds transportation access and improvements to low-income residents.
- Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian program.
- Regional Clean Air program.
- Regional Highway and Arterial Operations program.
- Local Streets and Roads Rehabilitation shortfall program.
- Transit Capital Rehabilitation shortfall program.

In addition, MTC administers state moneys, including those provided by the Transportation Development Act (TDA). Legislation passed in 1997 gives MTC and other regional transportation planning agencies increased decision-making authority over the selection of state highway projects and allocation of transit expansion funds for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

### **Issues of Mutual Concern Between C/CAG and MTC**

MTC has initiated the update of its long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the *Transportation 2035*, to be adopted in February 2009. The RTP will detail how the San Francisco Bay Area's transportation system will be maintained, improved and expanded over the next 25 years.

A major concern C/CAG has is the "County Discretionary" funding in the RTP. We would like the MTC Commission to develop the RTP in such that it will allow more county discretion in the allocation of Federal funds. We appreciate the vision MTC has set forth and its leadership in the regional programs such as the regional TLC/HIP, Bike/Pedestrian, and Clean Air programs. However, providing more county discretion in the use of Federal funds is of paramount importance to C/CAG because C/CAG is much closer to the priorities/needs of San Mateo county jurisdictions.

With the flexibility of county discretion, we will be able to determine the best mix of TLC, HIP, TOD, Bike, Pedestrian, Local Streets and Roads, transit, highway, Traffic System Management and other transportation programs in San Mateo county, and to achieve the vision and goals set forth by the MTC to coordinate transportation and land use, reduce greenhouse gas, and reduce traffic congestion.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

None.

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

Meeting No. 191

June 14, 2007

### 1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Gordon called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Jerry Carlson - Atherton

Sepi Richardson - Brisbane

Rosalie O'Mahony - Burlingame

Joseph Silva - Colma

Linda Koelling - Foster City

Tom Kasten - Hillsborough

Gina Papan - Millbrae (7:12)

Diane Howard - Redwood City

Bob Grassilli - San Carlos

Carole Groom - San Mateo

Rose Jacobs-Gibson - County of San Mateo

Karyl Matsumoto - South San Francisco, San Mateo County Transit District

Deborah Gordon - Woodside

#### Absent:

Belmont

Daly City

East Palo Alto

Half Moon Bay

Menlo Park

Pacifica

Portola Valley

San Bruno

#### Others:

Richard Napier, Executive Director - C/CAG

Sandy Wong, Deputy Director - C/CAG

Nancy Blair, Administrative Assistant - C/CAG

Miruni Soosaipillai, C/CAG - Legal Counsel

Tom Madalena, C/CAG Staff

John Hoang, C/CAG Staff

Diana Shu, C/CAG Staff

Mark Duino, C/CAG Staff

Matt Fabry, C/CAG Staff

Ray Razavi, South San Francisco - City Engineer

### ITEM 4.1

#### 4.0 CONSENT AGENDA

Board Member O'Mahony MOVED approval of Consent Items 4.1, 4.4, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8 and 4.9.  
Board Member Jacobs-Gibson SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 12-0.

- 4.1 Review and approval of the Minutes of Regular Business Meeting No. 190 dated May 10, 2007.  
APPROVED

- 4.4 Review and approval of Resolution 07-17 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute amendments to the agreements with various cities and the Alliance and Resolution 07-18 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute a funding agreement with the City of Redwood City for the provision of Congestion Relief Program shuttle services for a total cost not to exceed \$657,965 from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.  
APPROVED

Board Member Howard thanked the Board for approving Item 4.4 on the behalf of the people of Redwood City who are excited about a shuttle in their community. Genetech and Stanford are business partners who are willing to help with the cost of the shuttle.

- 4.5 Review and approval of staff to work with local jurisdictions and transportation agencies to provide candidate project information for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update.  
APPROVED
- 4.7 Consideration/Approval of a Recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of a Referral From the City of Redwood City, Re: Proposed Redwood City *North Main Street Precise Plan* for an Area Near San Carlos Airport.  
APPROVED
- 4.8 Review and approval of appointments to the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) and the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC).  
APPROVED
- 4.9 Review and approval of Resolution 07-16 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute amendment (No. 1) to the funding agreement with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) to receive an additional maximum amount of \$550,000 for joint and/ or co-sponsored programs, to an additive maximum amount of \$1,500,000.  
APPROVED

Items 4.2, 4.3, and 4.6 were removed from the Consent Calendar.

- 4.2 Update on Status of Agreements on the Hydrogen Shuttle. INFORMATION

The fiscal impact will be \$250,000/yr to be budgeted for the Alternative Fuel Program in the FY 2007/08 and FY 2008/09 C/CAG budget. The net cost to C/CAG is \$150,000 for FY 2007/08 after the TA reimbursement of \$100,000 if approved by the TA Board. The net cost to C/CAG is \$100,000 for FY 2008/09 after the TA reimbursement of \$150,000 if approved by the TA Board.

Board Member O'Mahony MOVED approval Board Member Richardson SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 13-0.



- 4.3 Approve Resolution 07-15 authorizing stormwater pollution prevention projects to be implemented by the Countywide Stormwater Program and funded under C/CAG's Vehicle Registration Fee (AB1546) program. APPROVED

A portion of the vehicle registration fee is returned to each city to help defer stormwater-related costs, and a portion is available for use by the countywide program. About \$600,000 per year is available for the stormwater programmatic portion of the vehicle registration fee. SMCWPPP's TAC recommended that the programmatic portion be used as follows:

1. Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Program in San Mateo County for use in developing a stormwater design standards guidebook and for funding demonstration projects.
2. Car Wash Kits for municipalities to loan to fundraisers to prevent the discharge of vehicle washwaters to the storm drain.

Board Member O'Mahony MOVED approval if staff will revise the contents of the kit to the minimum that will make it productive, a learning experience, and will investigate the savings that can be accomplished by purchasing supplies in bulk. Board Member Kasten SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 13-0.

- 4.6 Review and approval of Resolution 07-19 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute agreements between the City/ County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) and Eisenberg, Olivieri, and Associates (EOA), Inc., and San Mateo County Division of Environmental Health for services for the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program. APPROVED

Staff issued a Request for Proposals for technical consulting services in March 2007. Only two proposals were submitted, one by EOA, Inc. and one by County Environmental Health. EOA currently provides overall technical support to the Program and focused support for the Municipal Maintenance, New and Redevelopment, Watershed Assessment and Monitoring, and Commercial/Industrial and Illicit Discharge Program components, while County Environmental Health provides focused support for the Public Information and Participation (PIP) Program component. EOA will provide additional PIP support to assist County Environmental Health and ensure overall integration of PIP activities with the Program.

Board Member Kasten MOVED approval Board Member O'Mahony SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 13-0.

## 5.0 REGULAR AGENDA

- 5.1 Review and approval of C/CAG Legislative positions and Legislative update. INFORMATION  
(A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified.)

Staff provided the current status on C/CAG Sponsored Bills:

- SB 613 – reauthorization of AB 1546 has passed out of Senate and will be heard in the Assembly. First Assembly Committee hearing will be on June 27, 2007.
- AB 468 – Abandoned Vehicle Abatement will be heard on the Assembly Floor on June 5. If the bill passes, it will go to the Senate, else it will go to the dead bill file.
- June 8, 2007 is the last day to pass bills out of house of origin. Therefore, some bills on this list may be dropped.

5.1.1 Support for SCA 12 (Yee and Torlakson) and ACA 8 (De La Torre).

APPROVED

Support for SCA 12 (Yee and Torlakson) – Amendment to the State Constitution Regarding Fees for Stormwater and Urban Runoff.

This proposal states that Stormwater and Urban Runoff be added to the list of exemptions from a 2/3 vote of the electorate residing in the area affected by the fee or charge.

Board Member O'Mahony MOVED approval. Board Member Richardson SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 13-0.

Support for ACA 8 (De La Torre) – Amendment to the State Constitution Regarding Eminent Domain.

League of California Cities is urging cities and counties to support ACA 8 to ensure that homeowners and small businesses are given strong protections against eminent domain.

Board Member Richardson MOVED approval. Board Member Jacobs-Gibson SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 13-0.

5.2 Review and approval of Resolution 07-20 adopting the C/CAG 2007-08 Program Budget and Fees. APPROVED

A detailed report was given at the May C/CAG Board meeting. This was a follow up with explanations regarding any changes since the May meeting.

Staff will look into creating a policy for transferring and identifying a level of reserve in the funds.

Board Member O'Mahony MOVED approval. Board Member Howard SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 13-0.

5.3 Status Report on the Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit. INFORMATION

The San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (Countywide Program)'s municipal stormwater permit expired in 7/04, and has been administratively extended by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) staff pending its re-issuance. RWQCB staff, with the agreement of the Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA) program managers, are proposing to replace current countywide municipal stormwater permits with a Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) for all Bay Area municipalities to standardize stormwater requirements in this region.

Staff provided a summary of the progress in developing the MRP, significant issues of which elected officials need to be aware, such as potential significant costs to implement new permit requirements, and future steps in the MRP process.

5.4 Authorization to submit an application to the Association of Bay Area Governments to designate the El Camino Real corridor as a Priority Development Area under the Focus Our Vision (FOCUS) program. APPROVED

The purpose of the program is to provide incentives for local jurisdictions to accommodate growth in compact, infill development patterns that are of mixed use near transit and job centers with an emphasis on housing development. In October 2007, ABAG's General Assembly will review and

evaluate the applications. Approved applications will be qualified as Priority Development Areas.

Board Member Howard MOVED approval. Board Member Jacobs-Gibson SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED** 13-0.

## 6.0 COMMITTEE REPORTS

### 6.1 Committee Reports (oral reports).

None.

### 6.2 Chairperson's Report.

None.

## 7.0 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

CCAG's reauthorization was unanimous by the cities and the County.

The Bay Bridge tour is scheduled for Wednesday, 6/27. Details will be provided.

## 8.0 COMMUNICATIONS - Information Only

Copies of communications are included for C/CAG Board Members and Alternates only. To request a copy of the communications, contact Nancy Blair at 650 5991406 or [nblair@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:nblair@co.sanmateo.ca.us) or download a copy from C/CAG's website – [www.ccag.ca.gov](http://www.ccag.ca.gov).

### 8.1 Letter from Richard Napier, Executive Director, C/CAG to Honorable Alan Lowenthal, Chair, Senate Transportation Committee, and Honorable Joseph S. Simitian, State Capitol - Room 2080, dated 4/02/07. Re: Support of C/CAG Sponsored Senate Bill (SB) 613.

### 8.2 Letters from agencies (listed below) to Honorable Joseph S. Simitian, State Capitol - Room 2080, dated March through May 2007. Re: Support of C/CAG Sponsored Senate Bill (SB) 613.

Alan B. Carlson, Mayor, Town of Atherton

Steven W. Waldo, Mayor, City of Brisbane

Terry Nagel, Mayor, City of Burlingame

Ron Cox, Mayor, City of Foster City

Catherine U. Mullooly, Mayor, Town of Hillsborough

Kelly Fergusson, Mayor of Menlo Park

Angela Howard, Town Administrator, Portola Valley

Barbara Pierce, Mayor, City of Redwood City

Laurence K. Buckmaster, President & CEO, Redwood City San Mateo County Chamber of Commerce

Thomas J. Davids, Mayor, City of San Carlos

John Matthews, Mayor, City of San Mateo

Richard A. Garbarino, Mayor, City of South San Francisco

Daniel S. Cruey, President & CEO, Samceda  
Michael J. Scanlon, General Manager, CEO, SamTrans

- 8.3 Letter from Rose Jacobs Gibson, President, Board of Supervisors, dated 6/05/07.  
Re: SB 613. (Simitian), Local governments: vehicle fee for congestion and stormwater management.  
SUPPORT.

9.0 MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

10.0 ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

Special Meeting No. 192  
June 14, 2007

### 1.0 CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Gordon called the meeting to order at 8:40 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Jerry Carlson - Atherton  
Sepi Richardson - Brisbane  
Rosalie O'Mahony - Burlingame  
Joseph Silva - Colma  
Linda Koelling - Foster City  
Tom Kasten - Hillsborough  
Gina Papan - Millbrae  
Diane Howard - Redwood City  
Bob Grassilli - San Carlos  
Carole Groom - San Mateo  
Rose Jacobs-Gibson - County of San Mateo  
Karyl Matsumoto - South San Francisco, San Mateo County Transit District  
Deborah Gordon - Woodside

#### Absent:

Belmont  
Daly City  
East Palo Alto  
Half Moon Bay  
Menlo Park  
Pacifica  
Portola Valley  
San Bruno

#### Others:

Richard Napier, Executive Director - C/CAG  
Sandy Wong, Deputy Director - C/CAG  
Nancy Blair, Administrative Assistant - C/CAG  
Miruni Soosaipillai, C/CAG - Legal Counsel  
Tom Madalena, C/CAG Staff  
John Hoang, C/CAG Staff  
Diana Shu, C/CAG Staff  
Mark Duino, C/CAG Staff  
Matt Fabry, C/CAG Staff  
Ray Razavi, South San Francisco - City Engineer

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA

- 4.1 Review and approval of the Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program Report for the Third Quarter FY 06-07 ending March 31, 2007. ACTION

On 2/8/07, the Board approved guidelines that CCAG staff obtain approval prior to authorizing payment on the invoices for the AVA program. CCAG staff believes there is minimal risk the funds would have to be returned, therefore, staff recommends that the payment authorizations be paid for the Third Quarter FY 06-07 ending 3/31/07 and the report be approved.

Board Member Howard MOVED in accordance with the staff recommendation.  
Board Member Richardson SECONDED. **MOTION CARRIED 13-0.**

5.0 MEMBER COMMUNICATIONS

6.0 ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors

**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director

**Subject:** REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION 07-22 FOR APPLICATION TO DESIGNATE THE EL CAMINO REAL CORRIDOR IN SAN MATEO COUNTY AS A PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA).

(For further information or questions contact Richard Napier at 599-1420)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Board review and approve resolution 07-22 for application to designate the El Camino Real corridor in San Mateo County as a Priority Development Area (PDA).

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no fiscal impact from applying for the designation as a Priority Development Area.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The FOCUS program is administered by the Joint Policy Committee (JPC) consists of the following four regional agencies: the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC).

The purpose of the FOCUS program is to provide incentives for local jurisdictions to accommodate growth in compact, infill development patterns that are of mixed use and near transit and job centers with an emphasis on housing development. The regional agencies are committed to secure incentives and provide technical assistance to designated priority development areas so that positive change can be achieved in communities working to advance focused growth.

Priority Development Area (PDA) is defined as: 1) within an existing community, 2) served by existing or planned transit service, and 3) is planned, or is planning, for more housing.

At the June 14, 2007 Board meeting, C/CAG authorized staff to submit an application to designate the El Camino Real corridor in San Mateo County as a Priority Development Area (PDA) under the FOCUS program. The technical part of the application was submitted on June 29, 2007. A Board Resolution is due September 7, 2007

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- Resolution 07-22.
- Application for Priority Development Area Designation.

**ITEM 4.2**





## **RESOLUTION 07-22**

\*\*\*\*\*

### **A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG) AUTHORIZING THE APPLICATION TO DESIGNATE THE EL CAMINO REAL CORRIDOR IN SAN MATEO COUNTY AS A PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA)**

\*\*\*\*\*

**RESOLVED**, by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG), that

**WHEREAS**, the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in coordination with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and Bay Conservation and Development Commission (collectively, the “regional agencies”) are undertaking a regional planning initiative called FOCUS; and

**WHEREAS**, FOCUS program goals support a future regional development pattern that is compact and connected; and

**WHEREAS**, the regional agencies seek local government partners to create a specific and shared concept of where growth can be accommodated (priority development area) and what areas need protection (priority conservation area) in the region; and

**WHEREAS**, a priority development area must meet all of the following criteria: (a) within an existing community, (b) near existing or planned fixed transit (or served by comparable bus service) and (c) is planned, or is planning, for more housing; and

**WHEREAS**, local governments and congestion management agencies in the nine county San Francisco Bay Area are eligible to apply for designation of an area within their community as a priority development area; and

**WHEREAS**, the regional agencies are committed to securing incentives and providing technical assistance to designated priority development areas so that positive change can be achieved in communities working to advance focused growth.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the C/CAG Board, a Joint Powers Agency representing the twenty cities and the County in San Mateo County, authorizes submitting an application to designate the El Camino Real Corridor within San Mateo County as part of a priority development area comprised of areas along the El Camino Real from each of the jurisdictions along the corridor and authorizes C/CAG to act as the lead applicant.

**PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 9TH DAY OF AUGUST 2007.**

---

Deborah C. Gordon, Chair



# FOCUSING OUR VISION (FOCUS) PROGRAM

## Application for Priority Development Area Designation

Enter information in the spaces provided. E-mail this completed application form and attachments requested in this application form to [FOCUS@abag.ca.gov](mailto:FOCUS@abag.ca.gov) by Friday, June 29, 2007.

Part 1 - APPLICANT INFORMATION & AREA DETAILS	
Attach resolution showing local support for involvement in FOCUS	
a. Lead Applicant - City/County	City/ County Association of Governments (C/CAG)
Contact Person	Richard Napier
Title	Executive Director
Department	N/A
Street Address	555 County Center Fifth Floor
City	Redwood City
Zip Code	94063
Phone Number	650 599-1420
Fax Number	650 361-8227
Email	rnapier@co.sanmateo.ca.us
b. Area Name and Location	El Camino Real in Menlo Park, Redwood City, San Carlos, Belmont, San Mateo, Burlingame, Millbrae, San Bruno, South San Francisco, Colma, Daly City, San Mateo County
c. Area Size (recommended minimum acreage = 100)	1/4 of a mile on each side of the El Camino Real Corridor 10 Square Miles - 6,400 Acres
d. Public Transit Serving the Area	Samtrans Routes 390, 391, 397, KX, MX, PX, RX See Table 4-6

Part 2 - AREA INFORMATION		
	CURRENT CONDITIONS	FUTURE GOAL (Horizon Year: 2035)
a. Types of Zoning in Priority Area (land uses and densities)	Mix of Uses - Housing-Retail- Commercial-Industrial	Similar with TOD Emphasis around rail and bus transit centers. Emphasis on Housing
b. Total Housing Units (Best Estimate)	10,000	Increase Housing in Corridor by 10- 15,000
c. Total Jobs (Best Estimate)	30,000	Increase Jobs in Corridor by 5,000

Part 3 - ADDITIONAL AREA INFORMATION		
	Yes	No
a. Is the proposed priority area currently recognized in the General Plan (i.e., called out as TOD, infill etc.)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have other plans (any targeted planning efforts including specific plans, precise plans, area plans, and supporting environmental studies) been developed within the last 15 years that cover the priority area? Note: If yes, please <u>attach</u> brief list of individual planning efforts and date completed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Is the proposed priority area within the boundaries of a redevelopment area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## FOCUSING OUR VISION (FOCUS) PROGRAM

### Application for Priority Development Area Designation

#### Part 4 – MAP OF PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA

Attach a map showing the proposed boundaries of the potential priority area and any other relevant information for land uses, transit, etc. Photos of current conditions in the priority area are optional.

#### Part 5 – NARRATIVE

Type below or attach separately a maximum two-page (8½ x 11 with 12 point font) narrative that addresses the following questions and provides any other relevant information.

- What is the overall vision for this area?
- What has to occur in order to fully realize this vision? What has occurred there recently (past 5 years)? Describe relevant planning processes, and how the needs of community members were addressed.
- Describe how this priority area has the potential to be a leading example of smart growth for the Bay Area.

SEE ATTACHED NARRATIVE

For Additional Information See the following Web Sites

Redwood City Downtown Precise Plan:

<http://redwoodcity.org/cds/planning/precise/preciseplan.html>

City of San Mateo "El Camino Real Commercial Corridor Districts":

<http://cityofsanmateo.org/dept/planning/landuse/elcamino.html>

Grand Boulevard Initiative:

<http://www.elcaminoreborn.com/>

City/ County Association of Governments 2005 Annual Report:

[http://www.ccag.ca.gov/pdf/documents/ccag%202005%20\(final\).pdf](http://www.ccag.ca.gov/pdf/documents/ccag%202005%20(final).pdf)

## FOCUSING OUR VISION (FOCUS) PROGRAM

### Application for Priority Development Area Designation

#### Part 6 – POTENTIAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTED (check all that apply)

Note: Assistance is not being offered at this time. This information will aid the development of a tools and incentives package for designated areas.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	REQUEST FOR PLANNING GRANTS	REQUEST FOR CAPITAL GRANTS*
<input type="checkbox"/> Assistance with policies to implement existing plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistance with photo- simulations to depict future conditions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assistance with local workshops and tours <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Caltrans Negotiations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding for new area-wide specific plan or precise plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding to update existing area-wide specific plan or precise plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding for EIR to implement existing area-wide plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Matching Funds to C/CAG Planning Grants -\$740,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding for transportation projects (including pedestrian/bicycle) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding for housing projects <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding for water/sewer capacity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding for parks/urban greening <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Funding for streetscape improvements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Matching funds to County State/ Federal Transportation Funds  <i>* If any box checked, Part 7 applies.</i>

#### Part 7 – INFRASTRUCTURE BUDGET FOR PRIORITY AREA (If applicable and feasible)

If you are interested in capital grants as a potential incentive, please attach a budget that details the types of infrastructure improvements that will be needed in order to realize the vision for the priority area. This budget can include transportation, housing, road repairs, water/sewer capacity, parks and other critical amenities. A sample budget is provided for guidance.

If submitting an infrastructure budget is not feasible at this time, please note why:

In addition to electronic submission, mail one hard copy of this application and attachments requested in this application form to the following address:

Association of Bay Area Governments  
 Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
 Bay Area Air Quality Management District  
 Bay Conservation and Development Commission  
 P.O. Box 2050  
 Oakland, CA 94604-2050  
 Attn: Jaqueline Guzman

For questions regarding the application, please contact Jaqueline Guzman, ABAG Regional Planner, at [JackieG@abag.ca.gov](mailto:JackieG@abag.ca.gov) or 510.464.7994 or Doug Johnson, MTC Transportation Planner, at [djohnson@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:djohnson@mtc.ca.gov) or 510.817.5846.



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007  
**To:** C/CAG Board of Directors  
**From:** Richard Napier  
**Subject:** Review and accept the status update on the C/CAG 3<sup>rd</sup> Cycle Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Incentive Program

(For further information please contact Richard Napier at 599-1420 or Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

---

## RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board review and accept the status update on the C/CAG 3<sup>rd</sup> cycle Transit Oriented Development (TOD) incentive program.

## FISCAL IMPACT

This is no fiscal impact in receiving this update. Funding for the TOD program has been included in the adopted C/CAG budget.

## SOURCE OF FUNDS

The funding sources include the State Transportation Improvement Program, Surface Transportation Program, and Transportation for Livable Communities.

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The objective of this program is to encourage high-density housing (greater than 40 units per acre) within 1/3 of a mile of a BART or Caltrain station. For eligible housing projects, C/CAG will make a commitment to program the incentive funds to a transportation project identified by the sponsor if the housing is built within two years.

During the 3<sup>rd</sup> cycle of this program, a total of 14 projects were approved for the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program Initiative. Based on the number of bedrooms approved there will be \$1,182 available for each bedroom built and an additional \$148 available for each affordable bedroom built.

Approved TOD housing projects must be under construction by May 12, 2007 in order for sponsoring jurisdictions to be eligible to receive transportation funds. Six (6) out of the 14 approved TOD projects were "Not Under Construction" as of the May 12, 2007. Staff is working with sponsors of the remaining eight project sponsors to program the transportation projects, upon final confirmation of program requirements. The eight projects will have a total of 1296 bedrooms including 613 affordable bedrooms.

## ATTACHMENT

Summary of 3<sup>rd</sup> Cycle TOD program.

**ITEM 4.3**





Summary of 3rd Cycle TOD Program					
	Housing Project	Transportation Project	Incentive Amount	Total Bedrooms	Affordable Bedrooms
Burlingame	California Murchison Project	Not Under Construction.	\$0	0	0
Daly City	Landmark Plaza Development	Mission Street pedestrian improvement	\$229,020	190	30
Daly City	American Baptist Homes of the West	ADA ramps	\$54,530	41	41
Menlo Park	O'Brien at Derry Lane	Not Under Construction.	\$0	0	0
Millbrae	Belamor	Not Under Construction.	\$0	0	0
Redwood City	Walnut Street Condominiums	Not Under Construction.	\$0	0	0
Redwood City	Montgomery Villas	Sidewalk program.	\$163,590	123	123
San Bruno	Paragon Apartments (Archstone San Bruno 2)	ECR streetscape	\$383,132	316	65
San Bruno	Village at the Crossing	ECR streetscape	\$396,340	298	298
San Bruno	San Bruno Plaza	Not Under Construction.	\$0	0	0
San Carlos	1000 El Camino Real	Crosswalks, traffic calming devices, and landscaping along ECR and Caltrain station.	\$181,886	151	23
San Mateo	Palm Residences	Delaware street bike lane.	\$37,086	31	3
San Mateo	Delaware Place	Not Under Construction.	\$0	0	0
SSF	SSF BART Station Transit Village	BART Linear Park phases II & III.	\$177,012	146	30
			\$1,622,596	1,296	613



## **C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors

**From:** Richard Napier, C/CAG Executive Director

**Subject:** Review and Approval of Resolution 07-21, Authorizing the C/CAG Chair to Execute an Amendment to the Eisenberg, Olivieri, and Associates, Inc. (EOA) Contract in the Amount of \$62,000 for Managing the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program's "Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project" as a Programmatic AB1546 Project

(For further information or questions, contact Matt Fabry at 415-508-2134)

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Review and approval of Resolution 07-21, authorizing the C/CAG chair to execute an amendment to the Eisenberg, Olivieri, and Associates, Inc. (EOA) contract in the amount of \$62,000 for managing the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program's "Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project" as a Programmatic AB1546 project in accordance with the staff recommendation.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Not to exceed \$62,000, to be funded completely with existing AB1546 programmatic funds.

### **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

The AB1546 program collects revenue through a \$4 increase in vehicle license fees. One fourth of this amount goes toward programmatic stormwater projects. To date, approximately \$1.2 million has been collected for programmatic stormwater projects. The necessary funds for managing the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project for Fiscal Year 2007-08 (\$62,000) will come from these funds and not impact the existing approved NPDES budget.

### **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (Countywide Program) is developing a Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots project for which C/CAG previously approved a scope and budget. This project includes utilizing a consultant to develop a design standards manual for incorporating stormwater treatment measures into street and parking lot projects as well as providing competitive and non-competitive funds to municipalities in San Mateo County to incorporate such measures into their projects. This requires someone to manage the consultant contract and distribution of funds to competitive and non-competitive projects. The Countywide Program's technical consultant, EOA, proposed to provide these services as an alternative item in its recent proposal for services. The proposed scope of work is attached to this agenda report as Exhibit A. The stormwater Technical Advisory Committee discussed EOA's proposal and agreed it would be appropriate for them to manage the project. Therefore, staff proposes a line-item amendment to EOA's contract for the \$62,000, which will

**ITEM 4.4**

be funded completely with AB 1546 funds. The Countywide Program will evaluate the ongoing need for these services in future fiscal years when renewing the technical consultant contracts with EOA and County Health for fiscal years 2008-09 and beyond.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Resolution 07-21
- Proposed Amendment No. 1 to EOA's Contract
- Exhibit A - EOA's Proposed Scope of Work for Managing the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project

### **ALTERNATIVES**

- 1- Review and approval of Resolution 07-21, authorizing the C/CAG chair to execute an amendment to the Eisenberg, Olivieri, and Associates, Inc. (EOA) contract in the amount of \$62,000 for managing the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program's "Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project" as a Programmatic AB1546 project in accordance with the staff recommendation.
- 2- Review and approval of Resolution 07-21, authorizing the C/CAG chair to execute an amendment to the Eisenberg, Olivieri, and Associates, Inc. (EOA) contract in the amount of \$62,000 for managing the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program's "Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project" as a Programmatic AB1546 project in accordance with the staff recommendation with modifications.
- 3- No action.

**RESOLUTION NO. 07-21**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY  
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG)  
AUTHORIZING THE C/CAG CHAIR TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE  
EISENBERG, OLIVIERI, AND ASSOCIATES, INC. (EOA) CONTRACT IN THE  
AMOUNT OF \$62,000 FOR MANAGING THE COUNTYWIDE WATER POLLUTION  
PREVENTION PROGRAM'S "SUSTAINABLE, GREEN STREETS AND PARKING  
LOTS PROJECT" AS A PROGRAMMATIC AB1546 PROJECT**

**WHEREAS**, the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) manages the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program (Countywide Program); and,

**WHEREAS**, the C/CAG collects funds for stormwater pollution prevention projects through an increase in vehicle license fees in San Mateo County under AB1546; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Countywide Program developed and C/CAG approved a "Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots" project to address stormwater pollution from vehicles and transportation infrastructure in accordance with the requirements of AB1546; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Countywide Program requires assistance in managing the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Countywide Program's technical consultant EOA proposed providing management assistance as an alternative task in its March 2007 Proposal to Provide Technical Services; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Countywide Program's Technical Advisory Committee reviewed EOA's proposal and recommend EOA provide the additional management services; and,

**WHEREAS**, EOA provided the attached scope of services (Exhibit A) for managing the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lot Project; and,

**WHEREAS**, sufficient funds for providing management of the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots project have been collected through the vehicle license fee increase;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the C/CAG Chair be authorized to execute a line-item amendment to EOA Inc.'s contract in the amount of \$62,000 to manage the Countywide Program's Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project in accordance with EOA's proposed scope of services.

**APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 9TH DAY OF AUGUST 2007.**

---

*Deborah C. Gordon, Chair*



**AMENDMENT (No. 1) TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY/COUNTY  
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY AND EISENBERG,  
OLIVIERI, ASSOCIATES, INC.**

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments for San Mateo County (hereinafter referred to as C/CAG), at its June 14, 2007 meeting, approved an agreement with Eisenberg, Olivieri, and Associates, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as Consultant) to provide technical services to the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program for fiscal year 2007-08; and

**WHEREAS**, C/CAG has determined that additional consulting services are needed as defined in the attached Scope of Work (Exhibit A); and

**WHEREAS**, up to an additional sixty-two thousand dollars (\$62,000.00) may be required to complete said work; and

**WHEREAS**, Consultant has reviewed and accepted this amendment;

**IT IS HEREBY AGREED** by the C/CAG Chair and Consultant that:

1. Consultant will provide the additional consulting services described in the attached Scope of Work (Exhibit A); and
2. The added funding provided to Consultant by C/CAG under this amendment will be no more than sixty-two thousand dollars (\$62,000.00) for the completion of the additional work, thereby making the new maximum total contract amount seven hundred thirteen thousand five hundred dollars (\$713,500.00), and
3. All other provisions of the original agreement between C/CAG and Consultant dated June 14, 2007 shall remain in full force and effect; and
4. Payment for services under this amendment shall be on a time and materials basis, based upon the receipt of invoices for the actual costs, and with services to be performed only upon the request of C/CAG staff after review of specific work plans for individual tasks; and
5. This amendment to the agreement shall take effect upon signature by both parties.

For C/CAG Chair:

For Consultant:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deborah C. Gordon, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

Date: August 9, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved as to form:

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Miruni Soosaipillai, C/CAG Legal Counsel





## **Exhibit A**

### **Scope of Work to Help Implement the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project EOA, Inc. July 20, 2007**

This describes the tasks for assisting the San Mateo Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program's (SMCWPPP) Coordinator to implement this project during the period from August 2007 through August 2008.

#### **Assist with Consulting Services Consultant Selection, Contract Execution, and Contract Management**

1. Finish completion of a Request for Proposals (RFP) package for retaining consulting services to support the implementation of the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project. The consulting services will include developing a stormwater design standards guidebook of stormwater pollution prevention, treatment, and flow control BMPs for municipalities to use in planning new and revitalizing existing urban streets and parking lots to achieve multiple water quantity and quality benefits. The consulting services retained through the RFP may also include providing technical support to the municipalities that have received competitive grants from C/CAG to implement demonstration projects.

This task will include compiling a distribution list of firms to distribute the RFP to and advertising the availability of the RFP according to C/CAG's usual procedures. The RFP will be mailed to the firms on the distribution list.

This task will include helping to form a selection committee and to coordinate the activities of the selection committee by assisting them to review submitted proposals, conduct interviews, as needed, and make a recommendation for selection to SMCWPPP's Technical Advisory Committee. This work will be initiated during the summer and completed during the fall of 2007.

2. Assist with the implementation of activities needed for C/CAG to consider approval of the consultant selected and the execution of a contract for the agreed upon services. It is anticipated that the contract would be executed around December 2007.
3. Assist with managing the contracted services through August 2008. This will include checking that the work being performed meets the agreed upon scope of services, reviewing consultant invoices, making recommendations for payment, when appropriate, and assisting SMCWPPP's Project Coordinator with any needed tasks associated with managing the consultant contract.

The technical consultant will be responsible for developing a stormwater design standards guidebook for designing sustainable, green streets and parking lots in San Mateo County. This guidebook is anticipated to be completed around August 2008. It is anticipated that SMCWPPP's existing Sustainable, Green Streets, and Parking Lots Work Group, which is described below, would oversee the planning, preparation, and completion of the guidebook.

#### **Assist with the Management of the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Grants**

1. Continue to help SMCWPPP's Sustainable, Green Streets, and Parking Lots Work Group to plan and hold meetings to continue with the planning and implementation of the Sustainable, Green Streets and Parking Lots Project. This will include helping to implement actions based on the work group's direction and with the concurrence of SMCWPPP's Project Coordinator. This will include helping to conduct up to eleven work group meetings during the year.

2. Assist C/CAG to complete an agreement with San Mateo County Department of Parks on the use of the non-competitive grant funds that will be used to help plan and construct new stormwater pollution prevention and treatment features at the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve's new parking lot. The agreement between C/CAG and San Mateo County Department of Parks on the grant funds is expected to be completed during the fall of 2007. The grant funds will be used initially in 2008 to complete a preliminary design of the parking lot's stormwater pollution prevention and treatment features. Construction of the new visitor center and parking lot is expected to be completed within five years depending on the availability of funding from sources other than C/CAG. This task will include assisting the San Mateo County Department of Parks, when requested, to identify how to obtain the technical services they will need to complete the grant funded work.
3. Complete application forms and supporting materials needed to initiate a process for awarding competitive grants to municipalities within San Mateo County for demonstration projects. The work will include identifying a selection process for grant funding based upon agreed to selection criteria. A workshop will be held to explain the grant application and selection process and to assist interested municipalities understand how to complete grant applications. Following the selection of grants to fund, assistance will be provided to complete agreements between C/CAG and the grant recipients and to support the grant recipients, when requested, to obtain the technical services they may need to complete the grant funded work. These tasks are expected to be initiated this fall and continue through August 2008. The assistance will include checking with grant recipients that the work scheduled during this period is being completed on time or that adjustments to the schedule and scope of work are made when appropriate.
4. Continue to assist SMCWPPP to identify a non-competitive bayside countywide demonstration project and assist C/CAG to enter into an agreement with the grant recipient. If a worthwhile project cannot be identified, a recommendation will be made to C/CAG to consider transferring the funds allocated to this potential project to the competitive demonstration projects. This task should be completed during the fall of 2007.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** C/CAG Board of Directors

**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director

**Subject:** Review and approval of Resolution 07-23 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an agreement with SamTrans for \$100,000 to expand bus service in Pacifica.

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

---

## RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors review and approve resolution 07-23 authorizing the C/CAG chair to execute an agreement with SamTrans for \$100,000 to expand bus service in Pacifica in accordance with staff recommendation.

## FISCAL IMPACT

The total additional funding obligated through the new agreement and extensions will not exceed \$100,000 in order to implement expanded bus service to continue through August 31, 2009. This amount is derived from the remaining funds for the FY07/08 Coastside/Pacifica Shuttle.

## SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding to support the shuttle programs will be derived from the Congestion Relief Plan adopted by C/CAG and included in the Fiscal Year 07/08 budget. C/CAG's budget for Local Service Programs for FY 07/08 is \$500,000 plus \$300,000 in matching funds from the Transportation Authority.

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Pacifica shuttle was approved by the Board at the August 10, 2006 meeting for a total amount of \$156,956.38, which was the amount remaining from the original \$160,000 Devil's Slide emergency grant. The Pacifica Shuttle Stakeholders Committee had been convened to establish the service. The Pacifica Shuttle began service in October 2006. Unfortunately the route was in some cases duplicating existing SamTrans service. After learning of concern by SamTrans that ridership was being lost to the shuttle the Pacifica Shuttle Stakeholder Committee convened again to find a solution for the shuttle route that would be satisfactory to all parties. It

**ITEM 4.5**

was recommended by the committee to work with SamTrans by providing \$100,000 of the remaining funding for the shuttle to SamTrans for augmented bus service on the 14 and 110 SamTrans bus lines.

This augmented service will provide additional bus stops in Pacifica and will extend evening service on Route 14 Monday through Friday. Saturday service will be extended into the evening for both Route 14 and Route 110. There will also now be Sunday service on Route 14. The agreement with SamTrans will require SamTrans to provide this augmented service for 2 years. The approved Pacifica shuttle funds would have provided shuttle service for FY 07/08 whereas the agreement with Samtrans will provide the expanded bus service through FY 08/09. SamTrans has agreed to match the \$100,000 of C/CAG funding so that the service can be provided for two years through FY 08/09.

The new bus service can start as early as Sunday August 19, 2007 should the agreement be approved. The agreement will be written to the satisfaction of legal counsel for both C/CAG and SamTrans.

#### ALTERNATIVES

- 1) Review and approval of resolution 07-23 authorizing the C/CAG chair to execute an agreement with SamTrans for \$100,000 to expand bus service in Pacifica in accordance with staff recommendation.
- 2) Review and approval of resolution 07-23 authorizing the C/CAG chair to execute an agreement with SamTrans for \$100,000 to expand bus service in Pacifica in accordance with staff recommendation with modifications.
- 3) No action

#### ATTACHMENTS

- Resolution 07-23
- Email from Chuck Harvey at SamTrans

## **RESOLUTION 07-23**

### **A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY AUTHORIZING THE C/CAG CHAIR TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH SAMTRANS FOR \$100,000 TO EXPAND BUS SERVICE IN PACIFICA**

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments at its February 14, 2002 meeting approved the Countywide Traffic Congestion Relief Plan; and,

**WHEREAS**, one component of that Plan was support for the Local Service Program; and,

**WHEREAS**, on June 14, 2007 the C/CAG Board approved the Pacifica Shuttle program to be funded through June 30, 2008; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Pacifica Shuttle Stakeholder Committee has recommended that the funding provided through the local service program be directed to Samtrans for expanded bus service in Pacifica; and,

**WHEREAS**, C/CAG has determined that the expanded SamTrans bus service will benefit the community of Pacifica for two years instead of one year that the original Pacifica Shuttle grant funded;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the Chair is authorized to execute an agreement with SamTrans for \$100,000 for expanded bus service in Pacifica. The agreement shall be in a form approved by C/CAG Legal Counsel. In accordance with C/CAG adopted policy, the C/CAG Chair may administratively authorize up to an additional 5% of the original total contract amount in the event that there are unforeseen costs associated with the project.

**PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 9TH DAY OF AUGUST 2007.**

---

*Deborah C. Gordon, Chair*



**From:** "Harvey, Chuck" <harveyc@samtrans.com>  
**To:** "Christine Grubl" <christine@commute.org>, "Cook, Richard" <cookr@samtra...  
**Date:** 7/12/2007 3:05 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Schedule Next Pacifica Stakeholder Group Meeting

**CC:** "Mike Stevenson" <mike@commute.org>, "Kim Comstock" <kim@commute.org>, "...  
**Hi all:**

Since our last meeting I have had my Operations Planning group working up final run cuts and cost estimates for the augmentation of the SamTrans Pacifica services that we discussed. I would like to update you on our progress and define the next steps.

First, we have confirmed that we can provide the following service improvements as discussed:

- \* Extend Route 14 evening trips M-F to match up to the 110 until approx. 10 pm
- \* Add trips on Saturday to fill in the service to provide hourly service on Route 14
- \* Extend Saturday service on the 110 and 14 to provide a longer service day, with the last trip being coordinated to end at approx 9 pm
- \* Add 10 trips on Sunday to provide for an all new Sunday service for Route 14

Doug Johnson and Chester Patton from my team will email you the specific route/time sheets as soon as they lock them down in the next couple of days so that you have the exact trips and times that have been added.

Second, we have confirmed and are moving forward with implementing this service expansion by our August run book, which means by the new school year Pacifica residents will be able to enjoy these added services!

Third, we have confirmed the cost to operate these added services is approx \$95,000 annually on an incremental cost basis. This doesn't include costs to print and distribute new public timetables and maps, or any overhead allocation. SamTrans will contribute these additional costs, provided we reach a final agreement with the City of Pacifica and the Alliance to allocate the remaining \$100,000 from your Devil's Slide shuttle account to SamTrans. We will match that dollar for dollar PLUS eat the overhead and printing costs, which will result in our ability to jointly fund and operate these added services for a minimum of 2 years. We don't need to have the funds transferred to start. Assuming all agree, we will proceed and draft an MOU for your signature that will

define the agreement and allow the transfer of the funds to SamTrans as a revenue source to partially fund these services. My staff will draft the MOU materials and we'll work through this over the next few weeks.

Fourth, our operations team is currently reviewing the route alignment, with the goal to move the bus off Rosita and operate on Linda Mar as much as possible, which was desired by the committee to provide better access to destinations on Linda Mar. We will advise you our final recommendations, and how much assistance we might need from the city to get approvals to place new bus stops on Linda Mar. If this process takes longer than expected, we can light up the new service using the Rosita alignment and then transition to Linda Mar later this fall.

All we need to continue is to hear back from the committee and the Alliance that the above is acceptable and that you agree to co-sponsor these system improvements for the 2 year period as proposed above. In the interest of the time required to make these changes, my team is moving rapidly to implement, so if there are any last minute snags that I am not aware of, you need to get in contact with us ASAP.

This collaboration is an excellent example of working together to solve some of the unmet needs that your committee identified, while doing so using available resources at the lowest possible cost. This will allow us the time to market the service, get the word out there and create some ridership, which is our ultimate goal. We'll meet in the near future to make sure we establish some definitions and measurements of success that we can gather from our operating data and share with the group on a monthly/quarterly basis. While no one can guarantee that the service will survive past the 2 year pilot time period, it is our intent to give this a really good chance to succeed, while we look for future funding partnership opportunities that would allow such service augmentations to be renewed.

I will be out of town from July 13 until July 23 so if you have any questions or concerns, please contact Chester Patton, who is copied on this email, and can be reached at 508-6414 office or 740-6261 cell.

I want to personally thank all of you for placing your trust in SamTrans to work with us to improve transportation options for Pacifica residents. We take this responsibility seriously and will do all that we can to provide a high quality product when we initiate these added services.

Sincerely,



Chuck Harvey

Chief Operating Officer

SamTrans

-----Original Message-----

From: Christine Grubl [mailto:christine@commute.org]  
Sent: Wednesday, June 27, 2007 4:04 PM  
To: Cook, Richard; bwatson@parkpca.com; ocampov@ci.pacifica.ca.us;  
Harvey, Chuck; sued@parca.org; brumm-merrillm@ci.pacifica.ca.us;  
barietta@hotmail.com; nortonw@ci.pacifica.ca.us;  
langej@ci.pacifica.ca.us; tmadalena@co.sanmateo.ca.us;  
jlianides@pacificasd.org; paccollab@pacificasd.org;  
lennonm@ci.pacifica.ca.us; don@pacificachamber.org  
Cc: Mike Stevenson; Kim Comstock  
Subject: RE: Schedule Next Pacifica Stakeholder Group Meeting

The Agenda and minutes for our last meeting are enclosed for your reference for our meeting tomorrow at 1:30 p.m. As always, if any changes are needed to either attached document we can do so at the meeting.

Thank you and look forward to seeing you then.

Christine Maley-Grubl

---

From: Christine Grubl  
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2007 8:43 AM  
To: 'Cook, Richard'; 'bwatson@parkpca.com'; 'ocampov@ci.pacifica.ca.us';  
'harvey@samtrans.com'; 'sued@parca.org';  
'brumm-merrillm@ci.pacifica.ca.us'; 'barietta@hotmail.com';  
'nortonw@ci.pacifica.ca.us'; 'langej@ci.pacifica.ca.us';  
'tmadalena@co.sanmateo.ca.us'; 'jlianides@pacificasd.org';  
'paccollab@pacificasd.org'; 'lennonm@ci.pacifica.ca.us';  
'don@pacificachamber.org'  
Cc: Mike Stevenson; Kim Comstock  
Subject: RE: Schedule Next Pacifica Stakeholder Group Meeting



## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** C/CAG Board of Directors

**From:** David F. Carbone, C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff  
TEL: 650/363-4417; FAX: 650/363-4849; email: [dcarbone@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:dcarbone@co.sanmateo.ca.us)

**Subject:** Review and Approval of a Recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of a Referral From the City of Redwood City, Re: A Proposed Zoning Amendment and Adoption of a Precise Plan for the Proposed Peninsula Park Mixed – Use Development on Bair Island Road Southeast of San Carlos Airport

### RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, approve a unanimous recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), to determine that the proposed City of Redwood City zoning amendment and *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* are consistent with the applicable airport land use compatibility criteria, as contained in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996*, as amended, for San Carlos Airport, based on the Board's adoption of the following conditions:

1. Amend the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* document to include the following text to address airport-related safety concerns:  
  
“Future development within the *Peninsula Park Precise Plan* area shall comply with all relevant FAA standards and criteria for safety, regarding flashing lights, reflective material, land uses which may attract large concentrations of birds, HVAC exhaust vents, and any uses which may generate electrical or electronic interference with aircraft communications and/or instrumentation.”
2. Amend the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* document to include the following text to address FAR Part 77 airspace protection parameters<sup>1</sup>:  
  
“The project sponsor shall submit the height and location of each of the 10 residential towers to the FAA, via FAA Form 7460-1, “*Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration*” for an airspace impact evaluation, via a formal FAA aeronautical study. The findings of the FAA aeronautical study will be incorporated into the final approval for the construction of each tower in the *Precise Plan* area.”

---

<sup>1</sup> For FAA purposes, the maximum building height for each residential tower will include the height of the highest element on top of the tower (i.e. flag pole, light standard, HVAC equipment, etc )

**C/CAG Agenda Report, Re: Review and Approval of a Recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of a Referral From the City of Redwood City, Re: A Proposed Zoning Amendment and Adoption of a Precise Plan for the Proposed Peninsula Park Mixed – Use Development on Bair Island Road Southeast of San Carlos Airport  
August 9, 2007**

Page 2 of 6

**RECOMMENDATION - continued**

3. The project sponsor shall conduct and submit an acoustical study, to the City of Redwood City, for the residential portion of the project, in accordance with *California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 2*, to identify the exterior reference or criterion level for the project site. In the event that such study indicates an exterior reference or criterion level greater than 60 dB CNEL, then in that event, the project sponsor shall conduct and submit an additional acoustical study to identify appropriate acoustic elements to be installed during construction to achieve an interior noise level of not more than 45 dB CNEL in all habitable rooms, based on aircraft noise events related to aircraft operations at San Carlos Airport, commercial air traffic, and transient general aviation traffic that generally occurs within two miles of the project site. The report shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Redwood City Building Department, prior to the issuance of any building permits for residential construction. This requirement is consistent with the following sections of the *2001 California Building Code, Appendix 12, Division IIA – Sound Transmission Control*: Section 1208A.1.1 *Purpose and Scope*, Section 1208A.8.2 *Allowable Interior Noise Levels*, Section 1208A.8.3 *Airport Noise Sources*, and Section 1208A.8.5 *Compliance*.
4. The project sponsor shall conduct and submit an acoustical study for the proposed hotel on the project site to identify the exterior reference or criterion level for the project site. In the event that such study indicates an exterior reference or criterion level greater than 60 dB CNEL, then in that event, the project sponsor shall conduct and submit an additional acoustical study to identify appropriate acoustic elements, to be installed during construction, to achieve an interior noise level of not more than 45 dB CNEL in all sleeping rooms, based on aircraft noise events related to aircraft operations at San Carlos Airport, commercial air traffic, and transient general aviation traffic that generally occurs within two miles of the project site. The report shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Redwood City Building Department, prior to the issuance of any building permits for hotel construction. This requirement is consistent with the following sections of the *2001 California Building Code, Appendix 12, Division IIA – Sound Transmission Control*: Section 1208A.1.1 *Purpose and Scope*, Section 1208A.8.2 *Allowable Interior Noise Levels*, Section 1208A.8.3 *Airport Noise Sources*, and Section 1208A.8.5 *Compliance*.

**C/CAG Agenda Report, Re: Review and Approval of a Recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of a Referral From the City of Redwood City, Re: A Proposed Zoning Amendment and Adoption of a Precise Plan for the Proposed Peninsula Park Mixed – Use Development on Bair Island Road Southeast of San Carlos Airport  
August 9, 2007**

Page 3 of 6

**RECOMMENDATION - continued**

5. Amend the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* document to include the following text, to address state-mandated real estate disclosure for properties located within the adopted San Carlos Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary:

“All of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* area is located within Area B of the adopted Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary for San Carlos Airport. Therefore, all transfers of real property within the *Precise Plan* area are subject to the real estate disclosure requirements specified in Chapter 496, Statutes of 2002.”

6. Amend the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* document to include the following text, to address state-mandated general plan and/or specific plan compliance with the relevant airport/land use compatibility criteria in the adopted airport/land use plan:

“California Government Code Section 65302.3 states that a local agency general plan and/or any affected specific plan must be consistent with the applicable airport/land use compatibility criteria contained in the relevant adopted airport land use plan (CLUP). The goals, objectives, policies, and development criteria contained in this document are consistent with the applicable airport/land use compatibility criteria contained in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996*, as amended, for San Carlos Airport.”

**FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Redwood City has referred a proposed zoning amendment and draft *Precise Plan* for the proposed mixed-use Peninsula Park project to the Airport Land Use Commission (C/CAG Board) for a determination of consistency of the *Precise Plan* with the relevant land use compatibility criteria in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996*, as amended, for San Carlos Airport (see Attachment 1). The project site is located within Area B of the Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary for San Carlos Airport. The *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* is subject to ALUC/C/CAG review, pursuant to California PUC Code section 21676 (b). The state-mandated 60-day airport/land use compatibility review period will end on August 31, 2007.

**C/CAG Agenda Report, Re: Review and Approval of a Recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of a Referral From the City of Redwood City, Re: A Proposed Zoning Amendment and Adoption of a Precise Plan for the Proposed Peninsula Park Mixed – Use Development on Bair Island Road Southeast of San Carlos Airport  
August 9, 2007**

Page 4 of 6

**BACKGROUND - continued**

The proposed residential, commercial, marina, and public park complex is located on the northeast side of U.S. Highway 101, between the Whipple Ave./U. S. Highway 101 interchange and the Seaport Blvd./U. S. Highway 101 interchange, approximately 1.4 miles southeast of the threshold of Runway 30 at San Carlos Airport. The project site consists of the existing Peninsula Marina property on the southeast side Bair Island Road. A vicinity map of the Peninsula Park site, in relation to the threshold of Runway 20 at San Carlos Airport, is shown in the attached ALUC Staff Report.

The existing zoning on the site is General Commercial. The proposed land use policy action is to change the zoning from General Commercial to Precise Plan ("P"), to allow the mix of land uses proposed in the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* (see Table I. below). The *Precise Plan* document sets forth specific land use parameters, development standards, and design criteria to guide future development of the project site. Implementation of the *Precise Plan* would eventually replace the existing commercial/office/retail uses on the site.

The proposed *Draft Peninsula Part Precise Plan* includes the following land uses and maximum building heights:

**Table I.**

***Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan Land Use and Building Height Summary***

Total Project Site	33.24 acres
Residential <sup>1</sup>	796 units
Office	None
Hotel	200 Rooms
Commercial <sup>2</sup>	10,000 sq. ft.
Public Park Area	2.79 acres
Marina and Canals	5.38 acres
Marina Slips	25-40
Maximum Building Height	100-120 feet above ground level (AGL) (Note: 10 buildings at this height)

<sup>1</sup> Includes three housing types: townhouse/rowhouse, low-rise flats, and mid-rise towers, up to 120 feet AGL. Parking structures are internal to each portion of the residential development.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 2,500 square feet of sit-down restaurant space.

**C/CAG Agenda Report, Re: Review and Approval of a Recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of a Referral From the City of Redwood City, Re: A Proposed Zoning Amendment and Adoption of a Precise Plan for the Proposed Peninsula Park Mixed – Use Development on Bair Island Road Southeast of San Carlos Airport  
August 9, 2007**

Page 5 of 6

**DISCUSSION**

The C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) reviewed the proposed zoning amendment and *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* at a Special Meeting on July 26, 2007. The Committee members discussed each of the three airport/land use compatibility issues addressed in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan 1996*, as amended for San Carlos Airport: (1) height of structures/airspace protection, (2) aircraft noise impacts, including aircraft overflight, and (3) safety concerns, in great detail (see Attachment No. 1: C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, dated July 19, 2007). They also discussed the location of the project site, in relation to the Avigation Easement Review Area (AERA) boundary for San Carlos Airport. ALUC Staff noted that the project site was located beyond the AERA boundary and therefore, does not meet the criteria for the Committee and the C/CAG Board to request the City of Redwood City to require the grant of an avigation easement to the County of San Mateo, as the airport proprietor, as part of the City's approval of the project.

Prior to the meeting, the project sponsor, Paul Powers, requested that clarification language be added to ALUC Staff recommended Conditions No. 3 and 4., regarding acoustical studies to be conducted for the residential and hotel portions of the proposed project. The requested language was based on the relevant sections of *Appendix Chapter 12, Division II*, of the current *California Building Code*. ALUC Staff reviewed the proposed language and had no objection to the additional wording. ALUC Staff then proposed some additional wording to be added to the revised version of Conditions No. 3 and 4, to specify the relevant sections of *Appendix Chapter 12, Division II*, of the current *California Building Code*, on which the content of each condition was based (see Attachment No. 2).

The Redwood City Planning Staff present (T. Passanisi and B. Lyon) and Mr. Powers, who was also present at the ALUC meeting, has no objections to the revised wording in Conditions No. 3 and 4, as proposed by Mr. Powers and ALUC Staff. The ALUC unanimously approved the proposed revised wording for Conditions No. 3 and 4, as part of its recommendation to the C/CAG Board.

The Committee members also discussed the maximum height of the proposed 10 residential towers. The information provided by the City of Redwood City noted the residential towers could be as high as 120 feet above ground level (AGL). The City's information also noted there could be two height exceptions that would increase the maximum tower height. One of the exceptions could be for special architectural forms (up to an additional 20 feet) and the other could be for rooftop mechanical equipment (up to an additional 10 feet) (see p. 6 of the attached ALUC Staff Report). Given these possible height exceptions, the Committee members noted that the actual maximum height of the 10 residential towers could be up to 150 feet AGL, or 160 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). That height, however, is still well below the FAA airspace protection height of 252-302 feet AMSL for San Carlos Airport, at the project site location.

**AG Agenda Report, Re: Review and Approval of a Recommendation from the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of a Referral From the City of Redwood City, Re: A Proposed Zoning Amendment and Adoption of a Precise Plan for the Proposed Peninsula Park Mixed – Use Development on Bair Island Road Southeast of San Carlos Airport  
August 9, 2007**

Page 6 of 6

**ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment No. 1:** C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, dated July 19, 2007, with nine attachments

**Attachment No. 2:** Proposed Revisions to Conditions No. 3 and 4 of the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Dated July 19, 2007,  
Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review  
of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S.  
Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport  
July 26, 2007



City/County Association of Governments  
of San Mateo County

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay  
• Hillsborough • Menlo Park • Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo  
• San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

**C/CAG AIRPORT LAND USE COMMITTEE (ALUC)****STAFF REPORT**

**Please Reply To:** Dave Carbone, ALUC Staff, 455 County Center, Second Floor,  
Redwood City, CA 94063; TEL: 650-363-4417; FAX: 650/363-4849;  
email: [dcarbone@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:dcarbone@co.sanmateo.ca.us)

---

**TO:** C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Representatives and Alternates  
**FROM:** David F. Carbone, ALUC Staff *D.F.C.*  
**DATE:** July 19, 2007  
**RE:** **Agenda Item No. 3 - July 26, 2007 ALUC Special Meeting:** Consideration of  
a Referral From the City of Redwood City, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land  
Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the Proposed *Draft Peninsula Park  
Precise Plan* for a Property on Bair Island Road Southeast of San Carlos Airport

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC), recommend to the C/CAG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, that the Board determine that the proposed zoning amendment and *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* are consistent with the applicable airport land use compatibility criteria for San Carlos Airport, as contained in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996*, as amended, for San Carlos Airport, based on the Board's adoption of the following conditions:

1. Amend the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* document to include the following text to address airport-related safety concerns:

"Future development within the *Peninsula Park Precise Plan* area shall comply with all relevant FAA standards and criteria for safety, regarding flashing lights, reflective material, land uses which may attract large concentrations of birds, HVAC exhaust vents, and any uses which may generate electrical or electronic interference with aircraft communications and/or instrumentation."

*Airport Land Use Committee*

---

ALUC Chairperson:  
Richard Newman  
Aviation Representative

ALUC Vice Chairperson:  
Naomi Patridge, Council Member  
City of Half Moon Bay

Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff  
David F. Carbone, Sr. Planner / Airport Environs Planning  
County of San Mateo Planning & Bldg. Department

555 COUNTY CENTER, 5<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063 • 650/599-1406 • 650/594-9980

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 2 of 12

2. Amend the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* document to include the following text to address FAR Part 77 airspace protection parameters<sup>1</sup>:

“The project sponsor shall submit the height and location of each of the 10 residential towers to the FAA, via FAA Form 7460-1, “*Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration*” for an airspace impact evaluation, via a formal FAA aeronautical study. The findings of the FAA aeronautical study will be incorporated into the final approval for the construction of each tower in the *Precise Plan* area.”

3. The project sponsor shall conduct and submit an acoustical study, to the City of Redwood City, for the residential portion of the project, in accordance with *California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 2*, to identify appropriate acoustic elements to be installed during construction to achieve an interior noise level of not more than 45 dB CNEL in all habitable rooms, based on aircraft noise events related to aircraft operations at San Carlos Airport, commercial air traffic, and transient general aviation traffic that generally occurs within two miles of the project site. The report shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Redwood City Building Department prior to the issuance of any building permits for residential construction.
4. The project sponsor shall conduct and submit an acoustical study for the proposed hotel on the project site to identify appropriate acoustic elements, to be installed during construction, to achieve an interior noise level of not more than 45 dB CNEL in all sleeping rooms, based on aircraft noise events related to aircraft operations at San Carlos Airport, commercial air traffic, and transient general aviation traffic that generally occurs within two miles of the project site. The report shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Redwood City Building Department prior to the issuance of any building permits for hotel construction.
5. Amend the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* document to include the following text, to address state-mandated real estate disclosure for properties located within the adopted San Carlos Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary:

“All of the *Draft Peninsula Precise Plan* area is located within Area B of the adopted Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary for San Carlos Airport. Therefore, all transfers of real property within the *Precise Plan* area are subject to the real estate disclosure requirements specified in Chapter 496, Statutes of 2002.”

---

<sup>1</sup>. For FAA purposes, the maximum building height for each residential tower will include the height of the highest element on top of the tower (i.e. flag pole, light standard, HVAC equipment, etc.).

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 3 of 12

6. Amend the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* document to include the following text, to address state-mandated general plan and/or specific plan compliance with the relevant airport/land use compatibility criteria in the adopted airport/land use plan:

"California Government Code Section 65302.3 states that a local agency general plan and/or any affected specific plan must be consistent with the applicable airport/land use compatibility criteria contained in the relevant adopted airport land use plan (CLUP). The goals, objectives, policies, and development criteria contained in this document are consistent with the applicable airport/land use compatibility criteria contained in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996*, as amended, for San Carlos Airport."

## **BACKGROUND**

The City of Redwood City has referred a proposed zoning amendment and draft *Precise Plan* for the proposed Peninsula Park project to the Airport Land Use Commission (C/CAG Board) for a determination of consistency of key elements of the *Precise Plan* with the relevant land use compatibility criteria in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996*, as amended, for San Carlos Airport (see Attachment 1). The *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* area is located within Area B of the Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary for San Carlos Airport. The *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* is subject to ALUC/C/CAG review, pursuant to California PUC Code section 21676 (b). The state-mandated 60-day airport/land use compatibility review period will end on August 31, 2007.

The proposed residential, commercial, marina, and public park complex is located on the northeast side of U.S. Highway 101, between the Whipple Ave./U. S. Highway 101 interchange and the Seaport Blvd./U. S. Highway 101 interchange, approximately 1.4 miles southeast of the threshold of Runway 30 at San Carlos Airport. The project site consists of the existing Peninsula Marina property on the southeast side Bair Island Road. A vicinity map of the Peninsula Park site in relation to the threshold of Runway 20 at San Carlos Airport is shown in Attachment No. 2.

The existing zoning on the site is General Commercial. The proposed land use policy action is to change the zoning from General Commercial to Precise Plan ("P") to allow the mix of land uses proposed in the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* (see Discussion section below). The precise plan document sets forth specific land use parameters, development standards, and design criteria to guide future development of the project site. Implementation of the precise plan would eventually replace the existing commercial/office/retail uses on the site.

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 4 of 12

**DISCUSSION**

**I. *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan Overview***

As noted earlier, the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* site includes the existing Peninsula Marina property. That property was a portion of the former Marina Shores Village (MSV) project. The MSV project also included the non-contiguous Pete's Harbor property. The MSV project was reviewed by the ALUC in August 2004. A voter referendum repealed the City of Redwood City's precise plan zoning approval for the entire MSV project site and none of the project was ever built.

The letter to ALUC Staff, from the City of Redwood City, dated June 26, 2007 (see Attachment No. 1) includes a comparison of the proposed land uses for the Marina Shores Village (MSV) project and the proposed *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan*. This was done at Staff's request, to give the ALUC members a clear picture of the difference between the two plans. As shown by the comparison, the proposed Peninsula Park project is much smaller in scope than the MSV project (MSV – 1,930 residential units; Peninsula Park - 796 residential units) and includes much lower maximum building heights (MSV - 260 feet above ground level (AGL); Peninsula Park – 120 feet AGL). An illustrative site plan of the Peninsula Park project is shown in Attachment No. 3.

As outlined in the June 26, 2007 letter from the City of Redwood City, the proposed *Draft Peninsula Part Precise Plan* includes the following land uses and maximum building heights:

***Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan Land Use and Building Height Summary***

---

Total Project Site	33.24 acres
Residential <sup>1</sup>	796 units
Office	None
Hotel	200 Rooms
Commercial <sup>2</sup>	10,000 sq. ft.
Public Park Area	2.79 acres
Marina and Canals	5.38 acres
Marina Slips	25-40
Maximum Building Height	100-120 feet above ground level (AGL) (10 buildings at this height)

---

<sup>1</sup>. Includes three housing types: townhouse/rowhouse, low-rise flats, and mid-rise towers, up to 120 feet AGL. Parking structures are internal to each portion of the residential development.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 2,500 square feet of sit-down restaurant space.

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 5 of 12

## **II. Airport/Land Use Compatibility Issues**

There are three airport/land use compatibility issues addressed in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996*, as amended, for San Carlos Airport, that relate to the proposed *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* area. These criteria include:

(a). Height of Structures/Airspace Protection, (b). Aircraft Noise Impacts, and (c). Safety Concerns. Each of these issues is addressed in the following sections.

### **A. Height of Structures/Airspace Protection**

The height of structures and use of airspace are key safety elements related to airspace compatibility. There are three key objectives related to airspace compatibility, as follows:

- \* to avoid airspace impacts that may require significant changes in existing air traffic patterns
- \* to avoid airspace impacts that may result in the shifting of aircraft noise from one area to another
- \* to avoid the creation of land use conditions which, by posing hazards to aircraft in flight, can increase the risk of an accident occurring. These hazards include airspace obstructions and land use characteristics, which pose other potential hazards to aircraft in flight by attracting birds or creating visual and/or electronic interference with air navigation.

The Airport Land Use Commission (C/CAG Board) has adopted the provisions in *Federal Aviation Regulations FAR Part 77, "Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace"*, as amended, to establish civil airport imaginary surfaces, height restrictions, and federal notification requirements for project sponsors, related to proposed development within the FAR Part 77 airspace boundaries for San Carlos Airport. These imaginary surfaces include the Primary Surface, the Horizontal Surface, the Conical Surface, the Approach Surface, and the Transitional Surface.

The FAR Part 77 regulations contain three key elements:

- \* Standards for determining obstructions in the navigable airspace and designation and definition of imaginary surfaces for airspace protection
- \* Requirements for project sponsors to provide notice to the FAA Administrator of certain proposed construction or alternations that may impact the airspace in the airport environs

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 6 of 12

- \* Provide for the preparation of aeronautical studies conducted by FAA staff to determine the potential effect of proposed construction or alternations on the safe and efficient use of the affected airspace.

The *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996* (CLUP), as amended, for San Carlos Airport, indicates the following:

“Any proposed new construction or expansion of existing structures that would penetrate any of the FAR Part 77 imaginary surfaces for San Carlos Airport, as adopted by the Airport Land Use Commission (C/AG), is deemed to be an incompatible land use, unless the either the FAA has determined the proposed structure does not constitute a hazard to air navigation and/or the Caltrans Aeronautics Program staff have issued a permit to allow construction of the proposed structure.”

The maximum building height on the project site is proposed to be 120 feet above ground level (AGL). However, the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* identifies two possible height exceptions as follows:

1. Special Architectural Forms – Special architectural forms, such as tower roofs, atria, and other features are encouraged and may exceed height limits, subject to City review. It is anticipated that these elements would not exceed 20 feet in height.
2. Rooftop Mechanical Equipment – may extend up to 10 feet above the maximum building height standard provided equipment is screened subject to City review.

(Source: Letter to Dave Carbone, ALUC Staff, from Blake Lyon, Senior Planner, City of Redwood City, dated June 26, 2007.)

The *Draft Peninsula Park Specific Plan* area is located within the FAR Part 77 imaginary Conical Surface for airspace protection at San Carlos Airport (see Attachment No. 4). The Conical Surface elevation over the site varies from 252 feet to 302 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). As noted above, the maximum building height of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* is 10 stories, 100-120 feet above ground level (10 buildings at this height). Since the project site is approximately 10 feet AMSL, maximum building height would be approximately 130 feet AMSL.

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 7 of 12

The former Marina Shores Village (MSV) project included 10 residential towers on the Peninsula Marina portion of that project (the same property as the Peninsula Park project). Those towers ranged in height from 185 feet to 200 feet AGL. The FAA conducted an aeronautical study for each of the 17 towers in the MSV project to determine if the height of the towers created any airspace impacts. The FAA study concluded that each of the 17 towers would "...not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation...", provided certain conditions were met. A key condition was to require the project sponsor to provide appropriate marking and lighting for each tower, per FAA regulations, to ensure that each of the towers could be seen at night by pilots flying in the vicinity of the project site.

The FAA height evaluation information included above for the MSV project was presented to support ALUC Staff's recommendation herein, to require the Peninsula Park project sponsor to submit each of the proposed 10 residential towers to the FAA, via the FAA Form 7460-1 notification process, to allow the FAA to conduct an aeronautical study to evaluate potential airspace impacts. Based on the FAA's MSV tower height evaluation conclusion, for several towers up to 260 AGL (no obstruction, no hazard to air navigation), it is clear that the height of the Peninsula Park towers (120 feet AGL) would not have an airspace impact. However, based on a formal FAA review, the project sponsor could be required to provide appropriate marking and lighting on each of the 10 towers to enhance their visibility to pilots during the nighttime hours. That input would have to be provided to the project sponsor and the City of Redwood City, via a formal FAA aeronautical study.

**B. Aircraft Noise Impacts**

The 55 dB CNEL aircraft noise contour is recognized as the threshold for airport noise/land use compatibility in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996 (CLUP)*, as amended, for San Carlos Airport. Even though the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* area is located beyond (outside of) the 55 dB CNEL aircraft noise contour (see Attachment No. 5) and that it is also well outside the 55 dB CNEL aircraft noise contour, as shown in the *San Carlos Airport Master Plan Update Modernization Project Draft Environmental Impact Report June 2002*, the site is in a unique location, regarding aircraft overflight noise and related impacts. The site is subject to single-event noise impacts from: (1) aircraft arrivals and departures at San Carlos Airport, (2) commercial jet aircraft arrivals to San Francisco International Airport, and (3) transient aircraft traversing the area. Aircraft can be as low as 300 - 400 feet above ground in the project vicinity.

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 8 of 12

The *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* site is located near the aircraft approach path and normal traffic pattern for Runway 30 at San Carlos Airport (see Attachment No. 6). The site is also located beneath the designated noise abatement departure route for aircraft departing on Runway 12 at San Carlos Airport (see Attachment No. 6). Aircraft depart on Runway 12 when the prevailing winds are calm or from the south. Several years ago, at the request of the City of Redwood City, the FAA established a 20-degree offset to the departure heading on Runway 12, as a noise abatement measure, to mitigate aircraft noise impacts in the Centennial Neighborhood in Redwood City. That departure route takes aircraft over the *Peninsula Park Precise Plan* area and can create high single-event aircraft noise levels in the project vicinity.

It is the policy of the Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) and the Airport Land Use Commission (C/CAG Board) to request the land use authority (in this case, the City of Redwood City) to require the project sponsor to design noise-sensitive land uses to achieve an interior noise level of not more than 45 dB CNEL, based on aircraft noise events. This policy has been applied to proposed development within the 55 dB CNEL noise contour area and higher and in aircraft overflight noise areas within the airport influence area (AIA) boundary.

There are two noise-sensitive land uses proposed in the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan*: multi-family residential and a hotel. Based on potential impacts from aircraft overflight and the C/CAG/ALUC policy referenced above, this ALUC Staff Report includes two conditions to address aircraft noise mitigation for noise-sensitive land uses (see Condition No. 3 and No. 4 on page 2 of this Staff Report). These conditions are consistent with the noise insulation requirements in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996* (CLUP), as amended, for San Carlos Airport and with *California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2*, regarding interior noise levels for multi-family construction.

### **C. Safety Concerns**

The *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* area is not located within any of the runway safety areas for San Carlos Airport (see Attachment No. 7). Therefore, the safety compatibility criteria for Runway 12/30 do not apply (safety criteria source: *Caltrans Airport Land Use Planning Handbook January 2002*). However, the project site is located within the San Carlos Airport aircraft traffic pattern. The traffic pattern altitude is 800 feet AGL).

The *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996* (CLUP), as amended, for San Carlos Airport, identifies the following land use characteristics as hazards to air navigation:



**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 9 of 12

- \* Any use that would direct steady or flashing light of white, red, or green, or amber color toward an aircraft engaged in an initial straight climb following take-off or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing, other than FAA-approved navigational lights.
- \* Any use that would cause sunlight to be reflected toward an aircraft engaged in a straight climb following take-off or toward an aircraft engaged in a straight final approach toward a landing.
- \* Any use that would generate smoke or rising columns of air.
- \* Any use that would attract large concentrations of birds within approach-climbout areas.
- \* Any use that would generate electrical/electronic interference that may interfere with aircraft communication equipment and/or aircraft instrumentation.

The final specific architectural and design features of the proposed project are not known at this time. However, the City of Redwood City has indicated that the exterior building materials may include non-reflective materials, such as wood, stucco, and stone veneers. Other design features could include, but are not limited to site lighting, building lighting, size, type, and location of communication equipment, size and location of HVAC exhaust vents, flag poles, and water features that may attract birds.

The text in the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* should be amended to include the following language to address airport-related safety concerns:

"The project design and development shall comply with all relevant FAA standards and criteria for safety, regarding flashing lights, reflective material, uses which may attract large concentrations of birds, HVAC exhaust vents, and uses which may generate electrical or electronic interference with aircraft communications and/or aircraft instrumentation."

A list of the FAA Advisory Circulars and Code of Federal Aviation Regulations (C.F.R.) citations that will assist the City of Redwood City and the project sponsor in addressing the airport-related safety concerns described in the proposed amendment to the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan*, referenced above, is shown in Attachment No. 8.

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 10 of 12

**III. Compliance with California Government Code Section 65302.3**

California Government Code Section 65302.3 states that a local general plan and/or any affected specific plan must be consistent with the applicable airport/land use compatibility criteria in the relevant adopted airport land use plan (CLUP). To comply with this requirement, the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* should be amended to indicate the project site is located within Area B of the Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary for San Carlos Airport. The amendment should also include appropriate text that indicates the goals, development standards and urban design guidelines, and plan implementation provisions contained in the draft document are consistent with the relevant airport/land use compatibility criteria contained in the *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996* (CLUP), as amended, for San Carlos Airport.

**IV. Real Estate Disclosure**

**A. Chapter 496, Statutes of 2002**

Chapter 496, Statutes of 2002 (formally identified as AB 2776 (Simitian)) was signed by the Governor of September 12, 2002 and became effective on January 1, 2004. This statute affects all real estate transactions that occur within an identified airport influence area (AIA). It requires a statement (notice) to be included in the property transfer documents that indicates: (1) the subject property is located within an airport influence area and (2) the property may be subject to certain impacts from airport/aircraft operations. The *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* should be amended to include appropriate text that indicates all property for sale in the Peninsula Park development is subject to the real estate disclosure requirements of Chapter 496, Statutes 2002.

**B. Grant of an Avigation Easement**

The *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan December 1996* (CLUP), as amended, identifies an Avigation Easement Review Area (AERA) for San Carlos Airport. The AERA is described by a finite boundary that identifies a geographic area around San Carlos Airport, within which the Airport Land Use Commission (C/CAG Board) will request a local agency to require the grant of an avigation easement to the County of San Mateo, as part of the Commission's review of certain proposed local agency land use policy actions located within the AERA boundary.

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 11 of 12

The 1996 CLUP for San Carlos Airport, as amended, explains that the overall goal of obtaining an avigation easement is to balance the public need for the development of land in the vicinity of San Carlos Airport with the additional and sometimes conflicting need for the orderly development and continued safe and efficient operation of San Carlos Airport and to maintain the airport as a viable element of the local, regional, state, and national air transportation systems. The CLUP document also explains that an avigation easement is a legal recorded instrument that provides an airport proprietor with certain rights, regarding the use and protection of airspace over non-airport property.

Avigation easements in the vicinity of San Carlos Airport are obtained for the following purposes:

- \*
  - \* to prevent the creation or establishment of airport and/or airspace hazards for the free and unobstructed passage of aircraft through the air, thereby protecting the lives and property of users of San Carlos Airport and the occupants of land in the vicinity of the airport.
  - \* to prevent the impairment of the utility of San Carlos Airport and the public investment reflected therein to provide for the orderly development of the airport, which will help promote and enhance air transportation in the region.
  - \* to provide current affected property owner and subsequent affected property owner(s) with formal notice that his/her property is located near an airport and may be subject to impacts from airport and/or aircraft operations.

The Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan site is located outside of the Avigation Easement Review Area (AERA) boundary for San Carlos Airport (see Attachment No. 9). Therefore, the ALUC staff recommendations do not include a condition to request the City of Redwood City to require the grant of an avigation easement to the County of San Mateo, as the proprietor of San Carlos Airport.

ALUC Staff is aware there have been some discussions between the project developer and representatives of the San Carlos Airport Pilots Association (SCAPA), regarding the developer's consideration of voluntarily granting an avigation to the County of San Mateo. However, it is Staff's current understanding that no formal agreement has been reached between the two parties regarding this issue and that there has been no voluntary grant of an avigation easement to the County of San Mateo for the Peninsula Park project.

**C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff Report, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport C  
July 19, 2007**

Page 12 of 12

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Attachment No. 1:** Letter to Dave Carbone, ALUC Staff, from Blake Lyon, Senior Planner, City of Redwood City, dated June 26, 2007, re: formal request of the Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) to hold a Special Meeting on July 26, 2007 to review the City's proposed *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan*
- Attachment No. 2:** Graphic: Peninsula Park – Vicinity Map  
(Source: City of Redwood City)
- Attachment No. 3:** Graphic: Peninsula Park Illustrative Site Plan  
(Source: City of Redwood City)
- Attachment No. 4:** Graphic: *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* site location in relation to the San Carlos Airport Height Restrictions/Airspace Protection Surfaces
- Attachment No. 5:** Graphic: *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* site location in relation to the San Carlos Airport Noise Contours
- Attachment No. 6:** Graphic: *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* site location in relation to the San Carlos Airport aircraft traffic pattern and Runway 12 departure routes  
(Source: San Mateo County Department of Public Works Airports Division)
- Attachment No. 7:** Graphic: *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* site location in relation to the San Carlos Airport Safety Zones
- Attachment No. 8:** List of FAA Advisory Circulars and Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) Citations to Address Certain Airport-Related Safety Concerns
- Attachment No. 9:** Graphic: *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* site location in relation to the San Carlos Airport Aviation Easement Review Area (AERA) Boundary

alucstaffreportpeninsulaparkpreciseplan0707.doc

**Planning Division**  
1017 Middlefield Road  
P.O. Box 391  
Redwood City, CA 94063



**ATTACHMENT NO. 1**

Telephone (650) 780-7234  
Email: [tpassanisi@redwoodcity.org](mailto:tpassanisi@redwoodcity.org)  
Website: [www.redwoodcity.org](http://www.redwoodcity.org)  
Fax: 650-780-0128

June 26, 2007

Mr. Dave Carbone  
Senior Planner / Airport Land Use Committee  
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County  
455 County Center  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, California

Dear Dave:

The City of Redwood City would like to formally request that the Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) hold a special meeting on July 26<sup>th</sup> to review the City's proposed Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan (the Plan) for a determination of consistency with the San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. The Peninsula Park Precise Plan Area falls within the "San Carlos Airport Influence Area B Boundary". This location, plus the fact that the Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan requires a change to land use policy (Zoning Amendments), necessitates review by both ALUC and the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) Board.

The Peninsula Park Precise Plan is the City's planning tool which will guide development in this portion of the Bayfront area for the next 10 -15 years. The Plan covers approximately 33 acres of land and replaces the existing commercial zoning designation with new urban land use regulations and design guidelines and standards to allow residential development on this site. It describes a maximum amount of allowable housing units, and other land uses allowed in the Plan area. The vision of the Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan is to create a distinctive, water-oriented, urban residential community.

In June 2004, the City approved a General Plan Amendment and Precise Plan rezoning for the Marina Shores Village project. Subsequently, a local voter referendum, Measure Q, was passed that repealed the City's 2004 Precise Plan rezoning approval. Passage of the referendum resulted in a return of the Marina Shores Village project site to the previous zoning designations.

The table below compares the previous approved Marina Shores Village (MSV) land uses with the land uses proposed in the Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan. Because the scope of the MSV project has been reduced in site size (from a 46.45-acre split site) an additional column has been added to help identify the land uses on the Peninsula Marina portion of the site (33.2-acre site), which is the same land area addressed under the Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan. In both cases, the Peninsula Marina / Peninsula Park (33.2-acre site) portion of the site would require a Zoning Amendment to add a residential component to the existing zoning classification which is currently General

RECEIVED  
JUN 26 PM 2:14  
CITY OF REDWOOD CITY  
PLANNING DIVISION

Commercial. Under the Precise Plan process the zoning designation would be changed to "P" indicating the adoption of a Precise Plan.

As can be seen in the summary table below, the City could potentially allow residential and other uses in both cases; however, the scope of the Peninsula Park project has been substantially reduced from the previously approved Marina Shores Village project. One significant difference is that the previous MSV project allowed for 300,000 square feet of office uses, while the Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan removes the office component and adds a hotel component.

Comparisons of Land Uses

	Marina Shores Village (MSV)	Peninsula Marina portion of MSV	Peninsula Park (current project)
Total Project Site	46.45 ac.	33.24 ac.	33.24 ac.
Residential	1,930 units	1,297 units	796 units
Office	300,000 sq. ft.	300,000 sq. ft.	None
Hotel	None	None	200 rooms
Commercial	12,000 sq. ft.	12,000 sq. ft.	10,000 sq. ft.
Public Park Area	0.00 ac.	0.00 ac.	2.79 ac.
Marina and Canals	5.46 ac.	3.80 ac.	5.38 ac.
Marina Slips	80 to 100	50 to 60	25 to 40
Maximum Building Heights	240-260 feet (13 bldgs. at this height)	260 feet (8 bldgs. at this height)	100-120 feet (10 bldgs. at this height)

ac. = acres

sq. ft. = square feet

bldgs. = buildings

Another significant difference between the MSV project and the proposed Peninsula Park project is the reduction of overall building heights. The Peninsula Marina portion of the site contained eight (8) tower buildings approximately 20-stories, 260 feet in height, while the proposed Peninsula Park project contains ten (10) mid-rise buildings at 10-stories, 100-120 feet in height. The site plan, shown below, provides some reference to the general layout of the site with the corresponding land uses. The brown roof buildings shown in the lower left of the site plan adjacent to Bair Island Road and the Blomquist Extension represents the 200 room hotel, which is proposed at approximately 75 feet in height. Just to the north of the hotel is the approximately 2-acre community park.


Directly adjacent to the north edge of the community park is the proposed community retail hub, which contains the 10,000 square feet of convenience retail and restaurants, proposed at approximately 50 feet in height. The center portion of the site is defined by the marina and canals, with marina slips distributed throughout the waterway. Two overlook parks flank either side of the marina entry at the eastern-most portion of the

<sup>1</sup> Neighborhood-serving convenience retail and sit-down restaurant space. For the Marina Shores Village project, the restaurant was assumed to be 6,000 square feet of high-turnover, sit-down restaurant space open for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. For the Peninsula Park project, the restaurant is assumed to be 2,500 square feet of quality, sit-down restaurant space open only for breakfast and lunch.

<sup>2</sup> The Marina Shores Village project was not given credit for any public park area because the proposed park shown on the applicant's plan was on land not owned by the applicant.

site. The remaining, and largest portion of the site, is dedicated to the residential portion of the project (including structured parking for the residential uses), which is comprised of three primary housing types; 1) townhouse / rowhouse, 2) low-rise flats, and 3) mid-rise towers.

The parking structures are internal to each portion of the residential development and are wrapped with townhouses or rowhouses. There are approximately 58 townhouse or rowhouse buildings on the site that are proposed with an approximate height of 24 feet. Where directly visible on the site plan, the townhouse / rowhouses can be identified by the yellow roofs. The low-rise residential flats would be developed over the parking structures with an approximate height of 75 feet. As proposed there are 28 buildings at this height that can be distinguished on the site plans by the red "brick" colored roofs. The remaining 10 buildings are mid-rise tower buildings that range in height from 100 to 120 feet in height. These buildings are distributed throughout the site, but can be identified on the site plan with the squared roof form with a blue center. (A color copy of the site plan will be provided at the meeting, if you are unable to view this letter as a color copy).



The architectural styles have not been defined in the Draft Precise Plan, rather the goal is to have each phase of the development go through a design review process to determine the appropriate style of architecture. The Draft Precise Plan does, however, contain Development Standards and Urban Design Guidelines which address concepts such as building orientation and design; building massing and façade composition;



exterior materials; roof design, etc. Generally speaking the materials are proposed to be non reflective with the use of traditional residential materials such as wood, stucco, stone veneers. Non-traditional residential elements such as curtain walls would not be allowed.

The maximum building height on the project site is proposed to be 120 feet. Building Height for the purpose of the Precise Plan is defined as the average vertical distance measured from adjacent sidewalk(s) and/or publicly-accessible walkways to the top of the building wall, base of parapet, and/or eave line. Pitched, domed, and/or other special architectural roof forms are recommended and may qualify for a height exception. The Plan goes on to identify two possible height exceptions:

1. **Special Architectural Forms** – Special architectural forms such as tower roofs, atria and other features are encouraged and may exceed height limits subject to City review. It is anticipated that these elements would not exceed 20 feet in height.
2. **Rooftop Mechanical Equipment** – may extend up to 10 feet above the maximum building height standard provided equipment is screened subject to City review.


In either scenario the special architectural forms and/or rooftop mechanical equipment will remain substantially below the previously approved residential tower heights proposed under the Marina Shores Village project.

If approved, the Peninsula Park Precise Plan would provide more specific design detail that could insure a higher quality of development and more certainty compared to the existing zoning ordinance. For example, the Draft Precise Plan would require variations in building heights, building orientation and building separation throughout the project area which if approved could provide for a unique sense of quality and amenities that take full advantage of the waterfront orientation.

For your information, the City is currently processing an Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Upon completion of the EIR Addendum City staff will go back out to the community for a project update, followed by a public hearing for the Planning Commission to consider the project.

Overall, City staff believes that the Draft Precise Plan is in line with the County's Airport Plan. The City hopes that the ALUC will find this Plan consistent with the San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan. Please feel free to call me at 780-5934 if you have any questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,




Blake Lyon  
Senior Planner

C: Jill Ekas, Planning Manager



## Peninsula Park – Vicinity Map




ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Peninsula Park Project Site

# Peninsula Park


Don Sandy, FAIA, Architect and BKF Engineers

The Villas Existing Apartments



ATTACHMENT NO. 3






ATTACHMENT NO. 4

# SAN CARLOS AIRPORT HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS / AIRSPACE PROTECTION SURFACES

SOURCE: Applicable criteria from Federal Aviation Regulations FAR Part 77, 'Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace'




## SAN CARLOS AIRPORT NOISE CONTOURS

San Carlos Airport Master Plan Update Airport Modernization  
Draft Environmental Impact Report (June 2002)

ATTACHMENT NO. 5




# San Carlos Airport - Noise Abatement Procedures



- Arrival + Departure Routes
- Approximate SFO Class B Airspace
- Traffic Pattern Area
- Extremely Noise Sensitive Areas

For Information ONLY - Not to be used for navigation  
 SAFETY ALWAYS SUPERSEDES NOISE ABATEMENT PROCEDURES ATTACHMENT NO. 6



ATTACHMENT NO. 7

## SAN CARLOS AIRPORT SAFETY ZONES

SOURCE: Applicable safety zone criteria from the California Department of Transportation  
(Caltrans) Airport Land Use Planning Handbook January 2002

**List of FAA Advisory Circulars and Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) Citations and Websites to Address Certain Airport-Related Safety Concerns**

---

**FAA Advisory Circulars:**

**Flashing Lights:**

[http://www.faa.gov/airportsairtraffic/airports/resources/advisory\\_circulars/media/150-5345-43F/150\\_5345\\_43.pdf](http://www.faa.gov/airportsairtraffic/airports/resources/advisory_circulars/media/150-5345-43F/150_5345_43.pdf)

**Wildlife Hazards (Birds):**

[http://www.faa.gov/airportsairtraffic/airports/resources/advisory\\_circulars/media/150-5200-33A/150\\_5200\\_33a.pdf](http://www.faa.gov/airportsairtraffic/airports/resources/advisory_circulars/media/150-5200-33A/150_5200_33a.pdf)

**HVAC Exhaust Fan:**

<http://www.ihsaviation.com/ac/AC150-5370-10A.pdf>

**Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.):**

**Fixed Cellular Transmitters:** 47 C.F.R. 22.107(c)

**Common Carrier Fixed Microwave Transmitters:** 47 C.F.R. 21.107(b)

**Common Carrier Fixed Microwave Transmitters:** 47 C.F.R. 23(a)


**C.F.R. websites:**

<http://www.fcc.gov/mb/audio/decdoc/lettre/1991-04-16-pubnot.html>

<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cfr/index.html>

attachment\openparkalucstafptfaaadvcirandcfr citations.doc.doc







## ATTACHMENT NO. 2

### **Proposed Revisions to Conditions No. 3 and 4 of the C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee Staff Report, Dated July 19, 2007, Re: Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) Consistency Review of the *Draft Peninsula Park Precise Plan* on the Northeast Side of U.S. Highway 101 Near San Carlos Airport July 26, 2007**

The proposed revised language for ALUC Staff recommended Conditions No. 3 and 4 is shown below in **bold underline** print. The first revision in each condition (“the exterior reference or criterion level...”) was proposed by the project sponsor, Paul Powers. The second revision in each condition (“This requirement is consistent with...”) was proposed by ALUC Staff. Both revisions were unanimously approved by the ALUC.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

3. The project sponsor shall conduct and submit an acoustical study, to the City of Redwood City, for the residential portion of the project, in accordance with *California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 2*, to identify **the exterior reference or criterion level for the project site. In the event that such study indicates an exterior reference or criterion level greater than 60 dB CNEL, then in that event the project sponsor shall conduct and submit an additional acoustical study to identify** appropriate acoustic elements to be installed during construction to achieve an interior noise level of not more than 45 dB CNEL in all habitable rooms, based on aircraft noise events related to aircraft operations at San Carlos Airport, commercial air traffic, and transient general aviation traffic that generally occurs within two miles of the project site. The report shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Redwood City Building Department prior to the issuance of any building permits for residential construction. **This requirement is consistent with the following sections of the 2001 California Building Code, Appendix 12, Division IIA - Sound Transmission Control: Section 1208A.1.1 Purpose and Scope, Section 1208A.8.2 Allowable Interior Noise Levels, Section 1208A.8.3 Airport Noise Sources, and Section 1208A.8.5 Compliance.**
4. The project sponsor shall conduct and submit an acoustical study for the proposed hotel on the project site to identify **the exterior reference or criterion level for the project site. In the event that such study indicates an exterior reference or criterion level greater than 60 dB CNEL, then in that event the project sponsor shall conduct and submit an additional acoustical study to identify** appropriate acoustic elements, to be installed during construction, to achieve an interior noise level of not more than 45 dB CNEL in all sleeping rooms, based on aircraft noise events related to aircraft operations at San Carlos Airport, commercial air traffic, and transient general aviation traffic that generally occurs within two miles of the project site. The report shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Redwood City Building Department prior to the issuance of any building permits for hotel construction. **This requirement is consistent with the following sections of the 2001 California Building Code, Appendix 12, Division IIA - Sound Transmission Control: Section 1208A.1.1 Purpose and Scope, Section 1208A.8.2 Allowable Interior Noise Levels, Section 1208A.8.3 Airport Noise Sources, and Section 1208A.8.5 Compliance.**



## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** C/CAG Board of Directors

**From:** David F. Carbone, C/CAG Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC) Staff  
TEL: 650/363-4417; FAX: 650/363-4849; email: [dcarbone@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:dcarbone@co.sanmateo.ca.us)

**Subject:** Review and Approval of Resolution No. 07-24, Authorizing the C/CAG Chair to Negotiate and Execute an Agreement with Jacobs Consultancy to Provide Professional Consulting Services to Prepare an Update of the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (CLUP) for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport

### RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors, acting as the Airport Land Use Commission, adopt Resolution No. 07-24 (see attached), authorizing the C/CAG Chair to negotiate and execute an agreement with Jacobs Consultancy, to provide professional consulting services to prepare an update of the comprehensive airport land use compatibility plan (CLUP) for the environs of San Francisco International Airport.

### FISCAL IMPACT

The total contract amount for this project will not exceed \$360,000. Eighty percent (80%) of the project cost (\$300,000) will be funded by an FAA grant, issued to the C/CAG Board in 2006. The remaining 20% (\$60,000) will be funded by the C/CAG General Fund.

### BACKGROUND

In late 2003, Congress passed *Vision 100 – Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act*. Section 160 of the *Act* authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to make grant funds available to states and units of local government for compatible land use planning around large and medium hub airports across the nation. This is the first time federal funding has been set-aside for this purpose.

In June 2005, the FAA released grant program information and a list of 33 eligible airports. San Francisco International Airport (SFO) was included on the eligibility list. In September of 2005, the C/CAG Board, via the Executive Director, submitted a letter to the manager of the FAA Airports District Office (ADO) in Burlingame, to request the FAA to determine the eligibility of C/CAG to apply for and receive federal grant funds for airport/land use compatibility planning in the environs of SFO, per the relevant provisions in Section 160 of *Vision 100*. In November 2005, the FAA determined that the C/CAG Board was eligible to receive a federal grant under the new funding program and recommended that the Board submit a grant application to the FAA by the end of January 2006.

**ITEM 4.7**

**C/CAG Agenda Report, Re: Review and Approval of Resolution No. 07-24, Authorizing the C/CAG Chair to Negotiate and Execute an Agreement with Jacobs Consultancy to Provide Professional Consulting Services to Prepare an Update of the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (CLUP) for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport  
August 9, 2007**

Page 2 of 3

C/CAG staff submitted the grant application materials to the FAA at the end of January 2006. In response to that application, the FAA made a grant offer to the C/CAG Board of \$300,000. The grant funds (80% of the estimated project cost) are provided through the federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP). The C/CAG Board has previously committed to providing the 20% grant matching funds. It is important to note that C/CAG is the first unit of local government in the nation to apply for and receive a grant under the *Vision 100* Section 160 program. Much of the funding will be spent on consultant assistance to prepare the land use study.

**DISCUSSION**

The Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Request for Proposal (RFP) processes were consistent with the adopted C/CAG Board policy. Per guidance from the FAA, C/CAG staff has completed the following steps to select a consultant(s) to assist the C/CAG Board in the preparation of the CLUP update for the environs of San Francisco International Airport:

**February 2007**      **Prepared and distributed a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) to a list of 12 qualified consulting firms (the list was reviewed and approved by your office).** We received a response from 4 consultant teams. The RFQ responses were reviewed and evaluated. Since there were only 4 responders, the RFQ response list became the "Short List" for distribution of a Request for Proposal (RFP).

**April 2007**      **Prepared and distributed a Request for Proposal (RFP) to the "Short List" (all 4 teams).** The RFP responses were reviewed and evaluated

**July 2007**      **Interviewed all 4 consultant teams.** Each interview lasted about one hour. The interview panel members included the following persons:

Susy Kalkin, Planning Director, City of South San Francisco  
Nixon Lam, Sr. Environmental Planner, San Francisco International Airport  
Richard Napier, C/CAG Executive Director  
David F. Carbone, Sr. Planner, San Mateo Co./C/CAG Project Manager

**Prepared a final ranking of the consultant teams (prime consultants), as follows:**

- 1.      Jacobs Consultancy**
- 2.      Mead and Hunt**
- 3.      Chevalier, Allen, and Lichman, LLP**
- 4.      Coffman Associates**

**C/CAG Agenda Report, Re: Review and Approval of Resolution No. 07-24, Authorizing the C/CAG Chair to Negotiate and Execute an Agreement with Jacobs Consultancy to Provide Professional Consulting Services to Prepare an Update of the Comprehensive Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (CLUP) for the Environs of San Francisco International Airport  
August 9, 2007**

Page 3 of 3

The final consultant ranking shown on the previous page was based on review and evaluation of the responses to the RFQ and the RFP and the evaluations from the interview panel members. Based on the outcome of the consultant selection process (Jacobs Consultancy ranked No. 1), the attached resolution authorizes the C/CAG Chair to negotiate and execute an agreement with Jacobs Consultancy to provide professional consulting services to prepare an update of the comprehensive airport land use compatibility plan (CLUP) for the environs of San Francisco International Airport. The agreement will include a detailed scope of work and project time line.

The final product (planning document) will consist of a comprehensive update of the existing *San Mateo County Comprehensive Airport Land Use Plan (CLUP) December 1996*, as amended, for the environs of San Francisco International Airport. The document will include policies and criteria to achieve airport/land use compatibility for future development within a defined Airport Influence Area (AIA) boundary, including the most recent FAA-accepted Airport Noise Exposure Map (NEM) and noise compatibility criteria for a broad range of land uses. The content of the CLUP update will be guided by the relevant provisions in the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook January 2002* and by all relevant federal policies and regulations.

**ATTACHMENT**

C/CAG Board Resolution No 07 – 24.



## **RESOLUTION NO. 07-24**

### **A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG) AUTHORIZING THE C/CAG CHAIR TO NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH JACOBS CONSULTANCY TO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL CONSULTING SERVICES TO PREPARE AN UPDATE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLAN (CLUP) FOR THE ENVIRONS OF SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

**WHEREAS**, the C/CAG Board of Directors (Board) serves as the designated Airport Land Use Commission for San Mateo County, and,

**WHEREAS**, in its role as the Airport Land Use Commission, the Board is responsible for preparing, updating, adopting, and implementing a comprehensive airport land use plan (CLUP) for the environs of each of the three airports located in San Mateo County (Half Moon Bay, San Carlos, and San Francisco International Airport), and;

**WHEREAS**, the Board was the first unit of local government in the nation to receive a federal grant, under Section 160 of *Vision 100 - Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act*, approved by Congress in 2003, to prepare a comprehensive airport land use plan (CLUP) for the environs of a major air carrier airport (San Francisco International Airport), and;

**WHEREAS**, C/CAG Staff conducted a consultant selection process, per guidance from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), that included evaluating four consultant teams, via a Request for Qualifications (RFQ), a Request for Proposal (RFP), and an interview by a review team, and;

**WHEREAS**, the results of the selection process determined that Jacobs Consultancy (prime consultant) and its sub-consultant, Clarion Associates, was the preferred consultant team to assist the Board in preparing an update of the comprehensive airport land use plan (CLUP) for the environs of San Francisco International Airport,

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the C/CAG Board Chair is hereby authorized to negotiate and execute an agreement for and on behalf of the C/CAG Board, with Jacobs Consultancy, for the above-stated purpose, subject to approval by C/CAG Legal Counsel.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED THIS 9<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF AUGUST 2007.**

---

*Deborah C. Gordon, C/CAG Board Chair*





# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007  
**To:** City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors  
**From:** Richard Napier  
**Subject:** Review and Approval of AB1546 Countywide Congestion Management Program for Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Projects  
(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board approves the AB1546 Countywide Congestion Management Program for ITS projects

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

Approximately \$1.25M of the net revenue collected between July 2005 and December 2008 for the Traffic Congestion Management component of AB1546.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Funds for these projects are collected from the Vehicle License Fees (VLF) through the AB1546 Program.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Assembly Bill 1546 (AB1546) imposes an annual fee of up to four dollars (\$4) on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County to fund traffic congestion management and stormwater pollution prevention programs. The collection of the fees began on July 1, 2005 and terminates on January 1, 2009, unless the program is reauthorized by legislation. Fifty percent of the revenue is allocated to individual jurisdictions within San Mateo County and fifty percent is allocated to C/CAG for Countywide projects (25% for traffic congestion management and 25% for stormwater pollution prevention).

Current Countywide Traffic Congestion Management related projects include the development and implementation of hydrogen shuttles and fueling stations and development of the traffic incident management plan. At the January 2007 TAC meeting, it was recommended that staff convene a subcommittee to explore other potential projects to be implemented.

A subcommittee was formed consisting of Parviz Mokhtari, Ruben Nino, Larry Patterson, Mo Sharma, and Sandy Wong. The subcommittee considered several potential projects to mitigate traffic congestion and resulted with recommendations for upgrading traffic signal controllers and upgrading traffic detection systems with closed circuit television (CCTV) cameras. In addition to facilitating the management of traffic, the proposed traffic control and monitoring

**ITEM 4.8**

upgrades will also be key infrastructures in the development of an integrated countywide ITS program to improve inter-jurisdictional traffic management.

### **Committee Recommendation**

This item was initially presented at the May 2007 TAC and CMEQ meetings and comments and suggestions were received. The subcommittee reconvened and refined the application and project selection process. The revised AB1546 Countywide Traffic Congestion Management Program for ITS projects is described in the attached document. The TAC and CMEQ Committee recommend approval in accordance with staff recommendation.

### **ATTACHMENT**

AB1546 Countywide Traffic Congestion Mitigation Program - ITS Projects

**AB1546 - Countywide Traffic Congestion Management Program**  
**Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Projects**  
*Revised 6/13/07*

**Overview**

The AB1546 imposes an annual motor Vehicle License Fee of four dollars (\$4) in San Mateo County to fund traffic congestion and stormwater pollution prevention programs for the period of July 1, 2005 to December 31, 2008. The net total of the funds collected are allocated to the following programs:

- 25% - Local Cities/County Stormwater Pollution Prevention
- 25% - Local Cities/County Traffic Congestion Management
- 25% - Countywide Stormwater Pollution Prevention
- 25% - Countywide Traffic Congestion Management

**Budget**

Revenue collected under the Countywide Traffic Congestion Management programs currently fund Hydrogen Shuttle/Stations and Traffic Incident Management. It is proposed that these funds are also used for ITS related projects for upgrading traffic signal controllers and traffic detection systems. The projects and anticipated funding amounts are summarized as follows:

Countywide Traffic Congestion Management	FY 2005/06	FY2006/07	FY2007/08	Jul-Dec 2008	TOTAL
<b>REVENUE</b>					
• AB 1546	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$300,000	\$2.1M
<b>PROJECT BUDGET (Expenditure)</b>					
• Hydrogen Shuttle / Stations	\$250,000	\$125,000	\$125,000	-	\$500,000
• Traffic Incident Management	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$350,000
• ITS (Signal, CCTV)	\$250,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	\$250,000	\$1.25M

*Approximate amounts*

**Project Description**

The two types of projects eligible for funding include:

- Signal Control Upgrade (*approx. \$10-15K per controller*)
  - Signal controller upgrades is the replacement of current older controller cabinets with the new Model 170, 2070 or comparable model.
- Video Detection System Upgrade (*approx. \$35-40K per intersection*)
  - Video detection system upgrade is the installation of new Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras on traffic signals to replace the in-pavement detection loops. A video detection system assumes an industry standard camera system and associated equipments for all approaches of an intersection.

### Application Process

There will be a one time "Call for Projects", anticipated in September 2007. The total available funds of \$1.25M will be awarded to projects on a competitive basis. Jurisdictions will be able to apply for funding to reimburse ITS projects performed up to December 31, 2008. All projects are required to be completed (installation of ITS units) by December 31, 2008.

The maximum award amount a jurisdiction can receive has been established at \$200,000. There are no local match requirements. Estimated cost for a Signal Controller upgrade is \$10-15K per controller and for a Video Detection System upgrade is \$35-40K per intersection. Based on these estimates, jurisdictions can either apply for up to a maximum of thirteen (13) Signal Controllers, five (5) Video Detection Systems or a combination of both elements with a combined total of up to a maximum of \$200,000.

There will not be a predetermined dollar amount breakdown between the two project types. The total number of funded projects and maximum award amount per project is scalable and will be determined based on the total number of applications and type of projects received, total dollar amount requested, and the final project ranking and recommendations. The Selection Committee will consider all factors when establishing the final project recommendations. Since this is a competitive process, there are no guarantees that a jurisdiction will receive funding.

### Project Selection

Jurisdictions will be required to submit the following project information as part of the application.

- For Signal Controller Upgrades
  - Identify intersecting streets names and roadway classification
  - Provide Total Intersection Peak Hour Volume (i.e., Peak hour traffic volume on each approach of the intersection)
  - Indicate age of the in-place controller that will be replaced
- For Video Detection Upgrades
  - Identify intersection street names and roadway classification
  - Provide Total Intersection Peak Hour Volume (i.e., Peak hour traffic volume on each approach of the intersection)

Projects will be scored using the "Scoring and Prioritization" table below.

Project Type	Points	Maximum Points	
1. SIGNAL CONTROLLER UPGRADE			
Location			
▪ Arterial/Arterial	6	18	
▪ Arterial/Collector	4		
▪ Collector/Collector	2		
Total Intersection Peak Hour Volume			
• Top 20%	6		
• Middle 40%	4		
• Bottom 40%	2		
Years in Service			
• > 15	6		
• 10 to 15	4		
• < 10	2		

2. VIDEO DETECTION SYSTEM UPGRADE		
Location		
▪ Arterial/Arterial		6
▪ Arterial/Collector		4
▪ Collector/Collector		2
Total Intersection Peak Hour Volume		
▪ Top 20%		6
▪ Middle 40%		4
▪ Bottom 40%		2

12

Proposed projects will be ranked in order (highest to lowest) by total points under the two "Project Types". The project selection will occur in two steps. For the initial step, a maximum of \$100,000 may be awarded to each jurisdiction based on selection of the top ranked projects. For the second step, any remaining funds will be allocated for the next priority projects and no jurisdiction shall receive more than \$200K in aggregate for all projects. Projects are selected until all the available funds are allocated.

#### Reimbursements

Upon completion of the projects, jurisdictions will provide C/CAG a written notice on jurisdiction letterhead and signed by the City Manager requesting for reimbursement. Included with the letter will be proof that the project was completed and paid for. C/CAG will reimburse the actual construction and construction engineering costs incurred by the jurisdiction up to the award amount per project.

AB 1546  
COUNTYWIDE TRAFFIC CONGESTION MITIGATION PROGRAM  
INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS) PROJECTS  
APPLICATION

<b>JURISDICTION:</b>	
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED:</b> <i>(Maximum award amount of \$200,000 per jurisdiction)</i>	\$
<b>CATEGORY / PROJECT TYPE:</b> <i>(Please check applicable boxes)</i>	
Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)	<input type="checkbox"/> Signal Controller Upgrade <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Video Detection System Upgrade

<b>1. SIGNAL CONTROLLER UPGRADE</b> <i>(Model 2070 or comparable)</i>			
Number of Units Requested:		Upgrade Unit Cost:	\$
		Total Amount Requested:	\$
List units to be replaced in order of priority <i>(add additional lines or page as needed, maximum 13 locations)</i>			
No.	Location (e.g., Street name, intersection, roadway classification)	Intersection Volume*	Years in Service
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

\* Attach diagram to show peak hourly traffic volumes in each approach of the intersection.

<b>2. VIDEO DETECTION SYSTEM UPGRADE</b> <i>(A system incl. 4 CCTV cameras per intersection)</i>			
Number of Systems Requested:		Upgrade System Cost:	\$
		Total Amount Requested:	\$
List systems to be replaced in order of priority <i>(add additional lines or page as needed, maximum 5 locations)</i>			
No.	Location (e.g., Street name, intersection, roadway classification)	Intersection Volume*	
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

\* Attach diagram to show peak hourly traffic volumes in each approach of the intersection.

CONTACT INFORMATION	
Name1:	Name2:
Phone1:	Phone2:
Email1:	Email2:

I attest that, to the best of my knowledge, all information provided in this application and in conjunction with this application is accurate and complete.	
Signature:	Date:
Name: (Please Print)	Title: PW Director / City Engineer





# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** C/CAG Board of Directors

**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director

**Subject:** Review and approval of Resolution 07-25 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amendment to the agreement for an amount not to exceed \$12,000 with Economic and Planning Systems for the completion of the Housing Needs Study.

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the C/CAG Board of Directors review and approve of Resolution 07-25 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amendment to the agreement for an amount not to exceed \$12,000 with Economic and Planning Systems for the completion of the Housing Needs Study in accordance with staff recommendation.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

The total additional funding required for the amendment to the agreement will be \$12,000.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Funding for the Housing Needs Study is derived from the Congestion Relief Program and two grants.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The Housing Needs Study was distributed for comments in draft format as well as presented to the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee and C/CAG Board of Directors. In order to complete the study in the draft format the work required \$73,680 of the original \$75,000 contract. Economic and Planning Systems staff gave presentations to the CMEQ Committee and Board of Directors on the Housing Needs Study. In order to finalize the report with the changes that were requested the additional amount that will be required is \$10,427.

**ITEM 4.9**

### ALTERNATIVES

- 1) Review and approval of Resolution 07-25 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amendment to the agreement for an amount not to exceed \$12,000 with Economic and Planning Systems for the completion of the Housing Needs Study in accordance with staff recommendation
- 2) Review and approval of Resolution 07-25 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amendment to the agreement for an amount not to exceed \$12,000 with Economic and Planning Systems for the completion of the Housing Needs Study in accordance with staff recommendation with modifications.
- 3) No action

### ATTACHMENTS

- Resolution 07-25
- Amendment #1 to the funding agreement between Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. and City/County Association of Governments for support/consulting services

1

## **RESOLUTION 07-25**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CITY/COUNTY  
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY  
AUTHORIZING THE C/CAG CHAIR TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO  
THE AGREEMENT FOR AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$12,000 WITH  
ECONOMIC AND PLANNING SYSTEMS FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE  
HOUSING NEEDS STUDY**

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments at its September 8, 2005 meeting approved the execution of the agreement for \$75,000 with Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. for a Housing Needs Study; and,

**WHEREAS**, the draft report of the Housing Needs Study has been distributed for comments; and,

**WHEREAS**, C/CAG staff received comments on the draft report from the C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee as well as outside agencies and organizations; and,

**WHEREAS**, the C/CAG has determined that the draft report requires modifications; and,

**WHEREAS**, an amount not to exceed twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000) will be required for additional and new services;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the Chair is authorized to execute an amendment to the agreement for an amount not to exceed \$12,000 with Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. for the completion of the Housing Needs Study.

**PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 9TH DAY OF AUGUST 2007.**

---

*Deborah C. Gordon, Chair*



**AMENDMENT #1 TO THE FUNDING AGREEMENT BETWEEN  
ECONOMIC AND PLANNING SYSTEMS, INC.  
AND CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
FOR SUPPORT/CONSULTING SERVICES**

THIS AMENDMENT is entered into as of the 9<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2007, by and between Economic and Planning Systems, Inc., a California Corporation, and the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG), a public joint powers agency.

**WHEREAS**, a funding agreement (Agreement) between Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. and the City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County was executed on September 8, 2005, for Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. to provide a Housing Needs Study report; and,

**WHEREAS**, the C/CAG has determined that the draft report requires modifications; and,

**WHEREAS**, an amount not to exceed twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000) will be required for additional and new services; and,

**WHEREAS**, C/CAG, by Resolution 07-25, approved executing this amendment with Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, in consideration of the foregoing, the parties agree as follows:

1. The added funding provided under this amendment will be an amount not to exceed twelve thousand dollars (\$12,000), thereby making the new maximum total amount eighty seven thousand dollars (\$87,000), and the ending date for the Agreement is hereby extended to December 31, 2007; and

2. All other provisions of the original Agreement between Economic and Planning Systems, Inc. and C/CAG dated September 8, 2005 shall remain in full force and effect.

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF  
GOVERNMENTS

ECONOMIC AND PLANNING SYSTEMS, INC.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Deborah C. Gordon, C/CAG Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
James R. Musbach, Principal

\_\_\_\_\_  
Miruni Soosaipillai, C/CAG Legal Counsel  
(Approved as to form)



# **C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

**Date:** August 9, 2007  
**To:** City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors  
**From:** Richard Napier, C/CAG Executive Director  
**Subject:** Status Report on the Implementation of the Hydrogen Shuttle

(For further information contact Richard Napier at 599-1420)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Information Only

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

\$250,000 per year budgeted for the Alternative Fuel Program in FY 2007/08 and to be budgeted for FY 2008/09 C/CAG budget.

The net cost to C/CAG is \$150,000 for FY 2007/08 after the TA reimbursement of \$100,000 as approved by the TA Board.

The net cost to C/CAG is \$100,000 for FY 2008/09 after the TA reimbursement of \$150,000 if approved by the TA Board.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

AB 1546 Countywide Congestion Management Program Funds and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Funds and Transportation Authority Measure A Local Sales Tax, if approved.

## **BACKGROUND**

Resolution 07-12 authorized the C/CAG Chair to execute the necessary agreements with the Ford Motor Company, Air Products, San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA), San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), and the Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance for a Hydrogen Internal Combustion Engine (Hydrogen ICE) Shuttle Vehicle, to provide Caltrain shuttle service for two years up to a total of, not to exceed, \$250,000 net cost to C/CAG.

This report provides a status on the various agreements as of July 31, 2007.

**ITEM 4.10**

## **DISCUSSION**

Status of the agreements are as follows:

### **SMCTA – Provide Partial Funding for Caltrain Shuttle and Marketing Support [approved]**

SMCTA will sponsor up to 50% of the costs of installing, operating, maintaining, and other costs associated with the hydrogen shuttle program over the next two years in which the vehicle will be available to C/CAG. SMCTA has been budgeted \$100K for FY 07-08.

### **Ford Motor Company – Lease of Vehicle, Major Maintenance, and Staff Training [waiting for Ford]**

C/CAG has reviewed and signed the Ford Motor Company Agreement and is now waiting for Ford to execute the agreement.

1. Ford Motor Company will provide the vehicle and major service requirements: engine checkups, hydrogen system checks, etc. C/CAG will be responsible for minor service: tire rotation, doors, oil changes, etc. Ford has offered to contact a local Ford Dealership to provide service for hydrogen related components.
2. C/CAG will be responsible for \$10 Million dollars in liability insurance for the vehicle. Cost of the vehicle if damaged will be \$125,000 under the current agreement. Additional Insurance was required based on the various agreements and indemnity provision required. The insurance premium is \$2331 per year.
3. CARB has requested that Ford pay the registration fees.
4. Ford has agreed to California Courts for all dispute arbitrations.
5. Ford Motor Company will provide training to personnel working on the vehicle as specified in the users manual.

### **County of San Mateo - Insurance [pending]**

Estimated cost of providing \$10 million of Liability Insurance will be covered by the existing policy. However, an additional rider is required to cover provisions in the various agreements for this project. Therefore, the insurance premium will be \$2331 per year.

Copies of the various agreements have been forwarded to the County's Risk Management for review and incorporation into the insurance policies as necessary.

### **SCVTA - Temporary Fueling [waiting on SCVTA]**

The current contract with SCVTA includes provisions for fueling and minor maintenance of the vehicle, if necessary.



1. Minor service requirements: door jams, tire rotations, etc. will need to be provided by the user. Staff is working with SCVTA to provide this service on a cost reimbursement basis because current public safety rules require that all hydrogen-fueled vehicles be maintained in a hydrogen certified garage. The PCA maintenance station at East Palo Alto does not qualify for this type of certification. The SCVTA station and maintenance facility in Milpitas is already certified for hydrogen. However, there is a high probability that most of the maintenance work will be sent to a local Ford Dealership that has a maintenance agreement directly with Ford.
2. SCVTA has entered into an agreement with C/CAG to fuel at the Milpitas (Cerone Site) for a minimum cost of \$25 per kg. SCVTA operations personnel will fuel the vehicle.

**Peninsula Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance) - Operations and Management of Shuttle [executed]**

C/CAG contracted with the Alliance to provide operations and management of the shuttle in order to schedule operators and routes. The Alliance is in the process of contracting with the Parking Company of America (PCA) to operate the shuttles. C/CAG will then reimburse the Alliance for all administrative time and driver costs associated with this vehicle up to a maximum amount of \$100K per year. Costs of operating the hydrogen shuttle is \$32 per hour and \$68 per hour for the gasoline/diesel back up shuttle in the event the hydrogen shuttle is out of service. Towing charges are not part of this contract.

The proposed route is located in East Palo Alto and will connect to the Caltrain station.

**Air Products – Fueling at SCVTA [pending]**

Air Products requires a disclaimer from C/CAG and/or from PCA in order to allow other than SCVTA to fuel at their Cerone Site.

New agreements not previously listed but part of the hydrogen program:

**City of East Palo Alto – Service Route [waiting on the City]**

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between C/CAG and the City of East Palo Alto (EPA) has been signed by C/CAG and submitted to East Palo Alto. C/CAG will guarantee a minimum of 3 months service to the city pending start up of the hydrogen station at San Carlos.

**Local Ford Dealership - Maintenance on Hydrogen and Standard Systems [pending]**

CCAG staff and Ford are looking for a local Ford Certified Dealer to arrange for a two-year maintenance and repair contract. The dealer will have a warranty work contract with Ford Motor Company. And the dealer will have a scheduled maintenance and minor repair contract with C/CAG. The dealer will provide C/CAG staff with an estimate for standard maintenance. C/CAG will need an agreement with the dealership.

**Parking Company of America (PCA) - Towing Services [working]**

In the event of a breakdown, the vehicle will be towed by PCA to a C/CAG approved location. C/CAG will need to enter into an agreement with PCA to tow the vehicle.

**pendent Contractor – Logos [waiting to award]**

part of the introduction of hydrogen vehicles in San Mateo County, C/CAG staff recommends working with an independent contractor to provide graphic decals to be placed on the shuttle to inform the public about hydrogen and to recognize the various partners on this project. Preliminary costs are less than \$5,000.

**ACTION REQUIRED:**

Staff believes that all agreements and MOUs listed above will be completely executed no later than September 1, 2007.

C/CAG Legal Counsel has reviewed and signed-off on all agreements and MOUs prior to submittal to the C/CAG Chair for final execution.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Not Applicable

**ATTACHMENT:**

None

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007  
**To:** City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors  
**From:** Richard Napier, C/CAG Executive Director  
**Subject:** Review and Accept C/CAG Legislative Update

Note: A position may be taken on any legislation, including legislation not previously identified.

(For further information contact Richard Napier at 599-1420)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board accept the attached monthly update report on pending legislation.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

Not applicable.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Not applicable.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

### *C/CAG Sponsored Bills – Current Status*

SB 613 – reauthorization of AB 1546 has passed out of Senate and will be heard on the Assembly Floor. Meeting has not been set. Will need to have support letters from **all of the cities** sent directly to the Governor ready to go as soon as bill is approved in the Assembly (hopefully sometime in August).

AB 468 – Abandoned Vehicle Abatement passed on the Assembly Floor and will be heard in the Senate Appropriations Committee on August 20, 2007.

### *C/CAG Supported Bills – Current Status*

AB 239 – Recording Fees Contra Costa and San Mateo Counties – will allow these counties to charge a flat fee of \$25 for each recording instrument if a fund is set aside for the development of affordable housing for extremely low to moderate income households. In Senate Local Government is waiting to be scheduled.

**ITEM 4.11**

AB 1254 - Property tax revenue allocations: ERAF reduction: affordable housing. 2-Year Bill

SB 279 - 7/20/2007 Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 89, Statutes of 2007 !!!  
Thanks to everyone who sent letters of support for this bill regarding the parking of cars on state highways.

SB 286 – Allocation of Prop 1B funds. In Assembly Appropriations; meeting to be scheduled.  
Target date for releasing funds is now January 1, 2008.

ACA 8 - The California Constitution authorizes private property to be taken or damaged for public use only when just compensation has been paid to, or into court for, the owner of the property. This measure would require the public use for which the private property is taken to be stated in writing, prior to the commencement of eminent domain proceedings. In Assembly Local Government.

AB 887 - This bill would require a redevelopment agency, on and after January 1, 2008, to comply with certain notification requirements prior to adopting a resolution of necessity for the purposes of acquiring property by eminent domain, and within a specified time prior to taking certain actions relating to redevelopment. Going to the Senate for third reading.

SCA 12 - This bill would additionally exclude fees and charges for stormwater and urban runoff management from these approval requirements for the imposition or increase of a property-related fee or charge. Going to the Senate for third reading.

#### *C/CAG Opposed Bills – Current Status*

SB 303 - This bill would require the general plan, and each of its elements to encompass a planning and projection period of at least 20 years, except for the housing element , and would require each element, except for the housing , conservation, and open-space elements, to be updated at least every 10 years. The bill is being held in Assembly.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- C/CAG priorities as of August 2007.
- Status of bills supported by C/CAG - Details
- List of Bills from Senator McLeod: Local Government Bills During 2007
- List of SB 279 Supporters

**C/CAG LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2007 August Update**

No	Prop	Relevant Bills	Description	C/CAG	MTC	LOCC	CSAC	Ma	Mullin	Ruskin	Similian	Yee
<b>Priority 1: Increased Funding for Regional Water Management</b>												
1.1			Primary focus on maximizing funds from the adopted infrastructure bonds.									
	84	AB 1297	Regional water management			S			1			
	84	AB 1315	Flood protection			S						
	84	SB 732	Guidelines and definitions			S					1	1
	1E	SB5	Flood management									
		AB 1338	Local coastal programs: nonpoint source pollution	pending		S		2	1			

S = Support O = Oppose N = Neutral strikeout = dead or gutted bill

**1.2 Support efforts to exempt NPDES from the super majority voting requirements**

	SCA 12	Eliminate 2/3 majority vote for stormwater	S			W		S				
--	--------	--	---	--	--	---	--	---	--	--	--	--

**1.3 Include NPDES as a priority for funding in new sources of revenues (i.e. water bonds).**

**1.4 Advocate for C/CAG and San Mateo County jurisdictions to be identified as a pilot project to receive earmarked funding.**

**1.5 Support efforts to reduce NPDES requirements as a way to stimulate business development while still working to improve the quality of the Ocean, Bay, streams, creeks, and other waterways.**

**1.6 Support efforts to reform the NPDES program while still working to improve the quality of the Ocean, Bay, streams, creeks, and other waterways.**

**1.7 Support efforts to place the burden/ accountability of reporting, managing and meeting the NPDES requirements on the responsible source not the City or County.**

**1.8 Oppose efforts to require quantitative limits and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) measures since there are insufficient scientific methods to evaluate the benefits. For this reason C/CAG instead supports the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMP's) to the maximum extent practicable.**

# C/CAG LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2007 August Update

No	Prop	Relevant Bills	Description	C/CAG	MTC	LOCC	CSAC	CALCOG	Ma	Mullin	Ruskin	Simitan	Yee
Priority #2 Preserve Funding Protect against the diversion of local revenues including the protection of redevelopment funds and programs													
2.1	Support League and CSAC Initiative to protect local revenues including interpretation and implementation												
		AB-1256	housing-density bonus										
		AB-1449	housing-density bonus										
		AB-1091	TOD Implementation						1	1			

2.2 The 20% redevelopment housing set aside is the primary source of housing funds for cities and counties and must be protected and preserved.

## 2.3 ADDED Legislation supported by CCAG

	AB-23	Pedestrian-Countdown-Near-Schools or Senior-Centers		S	S								
	AB-239	Recording fees: Contra Costa and San Mateo Counties		S					1	2	1		
	AB-1493	Affordable-Housing-Innovation-Fund: housing trust fund:		S									
	AB-1254	Property tax revenue allocations: ERAF reduction: affordable housing		S					1				
	AB-468	Abandoned Vehicle Abatement		S							1		
Chapter	SB-270	State highways public nuisance		S									
	SB-613	Reauthorization of \$4 motor vehicle fee		S								2	1

S = Support O = Oppose N = Neutral strikeout = dead or gutted bill

**C/CAG LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2007 August Update**

No	Prop	Relevant Bills	Description	C/CAG	MTC	LOCC	CSAC	CALCOG	Ma	Mullin	Rusk	Stimian	Yee
----	------	----------------	-------------	-------	-----	------	------	--------	----	--------	------	---------	-----

**Priority 2: Preserve Funding**

Protect against the diversion of local revenues including the protection of redevelopment funds and programs

**2.4 ADDED Implementation of 2006 Bond Funds, Prop 1A, 1B, 1C**

	1B	AB 412	Project Delivery deadlines			\$							
	1B	AB 995	Allocation of proceeds			\$					1		
	1B	AB 1170	Eligibility and application of funds			\$			1				
	1B	AB 1227	Local Streets and Roads			\$							
	1B	AB 1351	Priority to self help counties			\$				1			
	1B	AB 1672	Implementation			\$				1			
	1B	SB 9	Trade corridors			\$					2	1	
	1B	SB 47	Allocation of bond proceeds			\$							
	1B	SB 286	Local streets and roads	S		\$	S					2	1
	1B	SB 748	Implementation State and Local Partnerships		S	\$						2	1
	1C	AB 29	Infill incentive			\$							
	1C	AB 792	allocation of \$100-M in housing-innovation funds			\$							
	1C	AB 1234	Infill development and incentive-grants			\$							
	1C	AB 1675	TOD implementation			\$							
	1C	SB 46	Implementation			\$						2	1
	1C, 84	SB 292	Allocation criteria			\$						1	1
		SB 303	Housing element law	O		O	pending	O				1	
	1C	SB 522	Infill incentives			\$							
	1C	SB 546	Housing levels			\$						1	2

**C/CAG LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2007 August Update**

C/CAG LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2007 August Update										Votes		
No	Prop	Relevant Bills	Description	C/CAG	MTC	LOCC	CSAC	CALCOG	Ma	Mullin	Ruskin	Simitian Yee
Priority #2: Preserve Funding												
Protect against the diversion of local revenues including the protection of redevelopment funds and programs												
	1C	SB 586	Affordable housing			S						2 1
	84	AB-832	implementation			S						
	84	AB 1253	Funding for local planning			S		S	1	1		
	84	AB 1303	Grants and loans for local agencies			S				1		
	84	AB 1602	Greening programs			S						
	84	SB 167	General plans, grants and incentives			S					1	1
	84	SB-763	Timely cleanup of brownfields			S						
		AB 57	Safe Routes to Schools								1	



# C/CAG LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2007 August Update

No	Prop	Relevant Bills	Description	C/CAG	MTC	LOCC	CSAC	Votes		
								Ma	Mullin	Ruskin
										Simitian
										Yee

Priority #3: Preserve Funding, Maintain Cost  
 Protect against increased local costs resulting from State action without 100% State reimbursement for the added costs.

Ensure that there is real local representation on State Boards and Commissions that are establishing policies and

## 3.1 requirements for local programs.

	ACA 8	Eminent Domain	S			S	S			
	AB 887	Eminent Domain	S					1	1	1
	ACA 2	Eminent Domain								
	SB 698	Eminent Domain								

S = Support O = Oppose N = Neutral strikeout = dead or gutted bill

Advocate for the appointment of Administration Officials who are sensitive to the fiscal predicament faced by

## 3.2 local jurisdictions

## 3.3 Oppose State action to dictate wage and benefits for local employees.

## 3.4 Oppose State action to restrict the ability of local jurisdictions to contract for services.

## 3.5 Advocate for State actions that are required to take into consideration the fiscal impact to local jurisdictions.

# C/CAG LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2007 August Update

No	Prop	Relevant Bills	Description	C/CAG	MTC	LOCC	CSAC	Ma	Mullin	Ruskin	Simittian	Yee
			Priority #4 Increase Funding									
			Support bills that reduce the vote requirement for special taxes such as public safety, infrastructure, and transportation.									
			4.1 transportation.									
			SCA 12									
			Eliminate 2/3 majority vote for stormwater									

Oppose bills that lower the threshold, but dictate beyond the special tax category, how locally generated funds 4.2 can be spent.

Support bills that reduce the vote requirement for special taxes but increase the vote requirement for general 4.3 taxes.

# C/CAG LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2007 August Update

No	Prop	Relevant Bills	Description	C/CAG	MTC	LOCC	CSAC	Ma	Mullin	Ruskin	Simitlan	Yee
----	------	----------------	-------------	-------	-----	------	------	----	--------	--------	----------	-----

Priority #5 Preserve funding  
 Encourage the State to protect transportation funding and develop an equitable cost-sharing arrangement to pay for any cost overruns on the construction of the Bay Bridge.

5.1 Urge the State to restrict or eliminate transfer of State transportation funds to the State General Fund.

5.2 Urge the State to continue to pursue a solution to the Federal Ethanol tax problem.

5.3 Urge the State to pay back the previous loans within the next four years.

5.4 Direct the C/CAG legislative advocate to monitor and advocate these positions.

5.5 Oppose efforts to divert any of the Regional Measure 2 funds to pay for any Bay Bridge cost overruns.

# C/CAG LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES FOR 2007 August Update

No	Prop	Relevant Bills	Description	C/CAG	MTC	LOCC	CSAC	Ma	Mullin	Ruskin	Simittian	Yee
Priority #6 Increase Funding												
Advocate for revenue solutions to address State budget issues that are also beneficial to Cities/Counties												

- 6.1 Support measures to realign the property tax with property related services
- 6.2 Support measures to ensure that local governments receive appropriate revenues to service local businesses.
- 6.3 Support measures to collect sales tax on Internet transactions.
- 6.4 Support expansion of the sales tax to personal and professional services.

Other issues:

Energy:

	AB 1223	Public Utilities: Net energy metering										
Chaptered	AB 1514	Energy: solar energy systems										
	AJR 3	Low-income home energy assistance										
	SB 451	Energy: renewable energy resource customer-generators										
	SB 1040	Public utilities										

S = Support O = Oppose N = Neutral strikeout = dead or gutted bill

July 25, 2007

TO: People Interested in Local Government, Public Finance, and Land Use

FROM: Senator Gloria Negrete McLeod

SUBJECT: Local Government Bills During 2007

Now that the deadline has passed for policy committees to hear bills during 2007, I wanted you to know about some of the more interesting bills affecting public finance, land use, and local governance. When the Legislature returns in August, some of these bills will face votes in the Appropriations Committees and on the Senate and Assembly floors. Others are two-year bills which legislators won't consider again until the second half of our biennial session in 2008.

#### LOCAL FINANCE

**SB 444 (Senate Local Government Committee)** conforms standby charge statutes to the requirements of Proposition 218. Status: Signed; Chapter 27, Statutes of 2007.

**SB 547 (Correa)** provides up to \$20 million of annual state funding to the counties with the lowest shares of property tax allocations. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

**SB 605 (Alquist)** authorizes Santa Clara County to increase its vital records fees by up to \$4 to fund the coordination of their domestic violence programs. Status: Senate Local Government Committee; two-year bill.

**SCA 12 (Torlakson)** adds stormwater fees to Proposition 218's voter approval exemption for sewer, water, and garbage property-related fees. Status: Senate Floor.

**AB 83 (Lieber)** creates the PARE program to reimburse counties for the schools' share of the costs of administering the property tax system. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

**AB 239 (DeSaulnier)** authorizes Contra Costa and San Mateo counties to charge \$25 fees on recorded real estate documents to fund affordable housing. Status: Senate Local Government Committee; two-year bill.

**AB 263 (Arambula)** corrects errors identified by the State Controller's Office which cause the Fresno Metropolitan Flood Control District to over-contribute property taxes to ERAF. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

**AB 373 (Wolk)** makes dozens of changes to the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Law and the School Facilities Improvement District Law. Status: Senate Floor.

**AB 938 (Calderon)** creates new procedures that will allow local officials to charge regulatory and user fees to pay for stormwater and urban runoff programs. Status: Senate Environmental Quality Committee; two-year bill.

**AB 1170 (Krekorian)** imposes deadlines on deciding state mandates test claims and completing audits of state mandates reimbursement claims. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

**AB 1222 (Laird)** enacts consensus reforms to the state mandate reimbursement process. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

**AB 1260 (Caballero)** clarifies how local officials should comply with Proposition 218's notice and protest procedures for property-related fees. Status: Senate Floor.

**AB 1261 (Caballero)** revises the statute governing public-private infrastructure agreements. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

**AB 1275 (DeSaulnier)** authorizes counties to increase their vital records fees by up to \$4 to fund the coordination of domestic violence and child abuse programs. Status: Senate Local Government Committee; two-year bill.

### **LAND USE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**

**SB 5 (Machado)** requires more planning for flood protection, including a new Sacramento-San Joaquin River Flood Management System Plan and amended general plans that result in denying subdivisions that don't meet performance standards. Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee.

**SB 167 (Negrete McLeod)** allocates money from Proposition 84 to help cities and counties revise and implement their general plans and to improve regional planning. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee; two-year bill.

**SB 821 (Kuehl)** requires the California Research Bureau to report on the implementation of the state law that requires cities and counties to impose conditions for water availability on larger subdivisions. Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee.

**SB 934 (Lowenthal)** allows public officials to create up to 100 Housing and Infrastructure Zones, to be financed with property tax increment revenues. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee; two-year bill.

**AB 162 (Wolk)** expands the requirements for flood management in city and county general plans. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

**AB 1066 (Laird)** requires the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to include information and advice about rising sea levels in OPR's *General Plan Guidelines*. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

**AB 1253 (Caballero)** allocates money from Proposition 84 to help cities and counties revise and implement their general plans, to improve regional planning, and to fund urban greening projects. Status: Senate Appropriations Committee.

### **REDEVELOPMENT**

**SB 437 (Negrete McLeod)** requires redevelopment agencies to report their project areas' time limits in their annual reports and five-year implementation plans. Status: Signed; Chapter 90, Statutes of 2007.

**AB 887 (De La Torre)** requires redevelopment officials to give more information to property owners who are subject to condemnation and to pay higher benefits when using eminent domain to condemn small businesses. Status: Senate Floor.

### **LOCAL POWERS & GOVERNANCE**

**SB 141, SB 142, and SB 143 (Senate Local Government Committee)** are the annual Validating Acts. Status: SB 141 was signed as Chapter 6, Statutes of 2007. SB 142 and SB 143 are on the Assembly Floor.

**SB 144 (Senate Local Government Committee)** is the annual Local Government Omnibus Act, making 23 relatively minor and noncontroversial changes to the state laws affecting local agencies' powers and duties. Status: Assembly Floor.

**SB 76 (Florez)** requires school district officials to receive the same ethics training as other local government officials. Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee.

**SB 103 (Cedillo)** requires local officials to report their economic development subsidies. Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee.

**SB 516 (Aanestad) and AB 1580 (La Malfa)** create two new special districts in Shasta and Siskiyou Counties to take over the State Department of Water Resources' watermaster duties. Status: SB 516 is in the Assembly Appropriations Committee. AB 1580 is on the Senate Floor.

**SB 233 (Cox)** broadens the definition of "project" for counties' design-build authority. Status: Assembly Floor.

**SB 343 (Negrete McLeod)** requires that agenda materials which are distributed within 72 hours of local legislative bodies' meetings be made publicly available at a specified location. Status: Assembly Floor.

**SB 416 (Ashburn)** allows all counties to use the design-build contracting method. Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee.

**SB 964 (Romero)** clarifies the Brown Act's prohibition on serial meetings and prohibits an agency from discriminating when providing writings to its local legislative body. Status: Assembly Floor.

**AB 701 (De La Torre)** doubles the statutory salary schedule that applies to city councilmembers and clarifies how city councils can further raise their salaries. Status: Senate Floor.

**AB 1496 (Swanson)** requires cities and counties with civil service systems to classify all employees, with exceptions, and imposes the same standards and procedures for temporary employees as school district merit systems. Status: Senate Local Government Committee; 2-year bill.

**AB 1634 (Levine)** requires cat and dog owners to spay or neuter their animals, with exceptions. Status: Senate Local Government Committee; two-year bill.

### **LAFCOs & BOUNDARY CHANGES**

**SB 162 (Negrete McLeod)** requires LAFCOs to consider environmental justice when they act on boundary changes. Status: Assembly Floor.

**SB 819 (Hollingsworth)** permanently allows LAFCOs to consolidate special districts that were not formed under the same principal act. Status: Signed; Chapter 98, Statutes of 2007.

**AB 745 (Silva)** makes protest petitions subject to the same requirements to disclose contributions and expenditures that apply to application petitions. Status: Signed; Chapter 109, Statutes of 2007.

**AB 1744 (Assembly Local Government Committee)** makes nine changes to the state laws affecting LAFCOs and local governments' boundaries. Status: Senate Floor.



The fastest way to get copies of these bills and the Committee's analyses, other analyses, histories, voting records, and any veto messages is from the California Legislature's official website: [www.leginfo.ca.gov](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov). You can also order a free printed copy of any bill by writing directly to the Bill Room, State Capitol (Room B-32), Sacramento CA 95814-4906.

More information about the Committee's work, including detailed references on land use, redevelopment, LAFCOs, and links to useful websites is available on the Committee's own website: [www.sen.ca.gov/locgov](http://www.sen.ca.gov/locgov).



## Bills Supported by CCAG

AB 101

(Ma) Vehicles: parking enforcement: video image evidence. (A-07/03/2007 [html](#) pdf)  
Status: 07/16/2007-From THIRD READING: In THIRD READING

Dead/2YR 1st Desk 1st Policy 1st Fiscal 1st Floor 2nd Desk 2nd Policy 2nd Fiscal 2nd Floor Conf./Conc. Enrolled Vetoed Chaptered

**Summary:** Would authorize the City and County of San Francisco (San Francisco), until January 1, 2012, to enforce parking violations in transit-only lanes and during street sweeping hours through the use of video image evidence. San Francisco would be authorized to install video cameras on city-owned public transit vehicles and city-owned street sweepers for the purposes of video imaging these parking violations. A designated employee would be required to review the video image for determining whether these parking violations had occurred and to issue a notice of a parking violation to the registered owner within 15 days of the violation. The video image records would be confidential and be available only to public agencies to enforce parking violations. This bill contains other existing laws.

### Vote Events:

06/26/2007 SEN. JUD. (Y:3 N:2 A:0)  
06/19/2007 SEN. T. & H. (Y:6 N:3 A:2)  
05/14/2007 ASM. FLOOR (Y:72 N:0 A:7)  
05/07/2007 ASM. TRANS. (Y:14 N:0 A:0)

**Position:** Support in concept

**Priority:** 2

**Subject:** Transportation - Roads,

AB 239

(DeSaulnier) Recording fees: Contra Costa and San Mateo Counties. (A-04/30/2007 [html](#) pdf)

Status: 06/27/2007-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.

Dead/2YR 1st Desk 1st Policy 1st Fiscal 1st Floor 2nd Desk 2nd Policy 2nd Fiscal 2nd Floor Conf./Conc. Enrolled Vetoed Chaptered

**Summary:** Would authorize the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors or the San Mateo Board of Supervisors to additionally charge a flat fee of not more than \$25, as specified for each document that is recorded, if the document is in excess of one page, for every real estate instrument, as defined, paper, or notice required or permitted by law to be recorded in Contra Costa County or San Mateo County. The bill would require the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors or the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, if it charges this fee, to establish a fund for deposit of the moneys raised by the increase, which shall be used to assist in the development of affordable housing for extremely low income households, very low income households, lower income households, and moderate-income households. This bill contains other related provisions.

### Vote Events:

05/29/2007 ASM. FLOOR (Y:42 N:35 A:3)  
05/09/2007 ASM. H. & C.D. (Y:5 N:2 A:0)  
03/28/2007 ASM. L. GOV. (Y:5 N:2 A:0)

**Position:** Support

**Priority:** 1

**Subject:** Housing,

AB 468

(Ruskin) Vehicles: abatement of abandoned vehicles. (A-07/10/2007 [html](#) pdf)

Status: 07/10/2007-Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on APPR.

[Dead/2YR](#) | [1st Desk](#) | [1st Policy](#) | [1st Fiscal](#) | [1st Floor](#) | [2nd Desk](#) | [2nd Policy](#) | [2nd Fiscal](#) | [2nd Floor](#) | [Conf./Concl.](#) | [Enrolled](#) | [Vetoed](#) | [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** Would authorize the service authority to use the fees imposed, as well as the moneys received from the Abandoned Vehicle Trust Fund for the costs associated with the enforcement of the ordinance adopted by the service authority. The service authority would be prohibited from offsetting the costs of vehicles towed under authorities other than the ordinance adopted by the service authority or when the costs are recovered by another provision of law. The service authority would be authorized to carry forward unexpended money in a fiscal year to the following fiscal year for the abandoned vehicle abatement program upon agreement with its member agencies. The service authority would be authorized to carry out an abandoned vehicle abatement from public property after providing a notice specified by a local ordinance of the jurisdiction in which the abandoned vehicle is located and that notice has expired. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Vote Events:**

07/03/2007 SEN. T. & H. (Y:6 N:3 A:2)  
06/05/2007 ASM. FLOOR (Y:58 N:21 A:1)  
05/31/2007 ASM. APPR. (Y:12 N:5 A:0)  
04/09/2007 ASM. TRANS. (Y:10 N:4 A:0)

**Position:** Sponsor

**Priority:** 1

**Subject:** Vehicle Abatement,

**AB 887**

**(De La Torre) Redevelopment: eminent domain: relocation assistance. (A-07/18/2007 [html](#) [pdf](#))**

**Status:** 07/18/2007-Read second time, amended, and to third reading.

[Dead/2YR](#) | [1st Desk](#) | [1st Policy](#) | [1st Fiscal](#) | [1st Floor](#) | [2nd Desk](#) | [2nd Policy](#) | [2nd Fiscal](#) | [2nd Floor](#) | [Conf./Concl.](#) | [Enrolled](#) | [Vetoed](#) | [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** Would require a redevelopment agency, on and after January 1, 2008, to comply with certain notification requirements prior to adopting a resolution of necessity for the purposes of acquiring property by eminent domain, and within a specified time prior to taking certain actions relating to redevelopment. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Vote Events:**

07/12/2007 SEN. JUD. (Y:3 N:1 A:1)  
07/12/2007 SEN. L.GOV. (Y:3 N:2 A:0)  
07/11/2007 SEN. L.GOV. (Y:5 N:0 A:0)  
07/11/2007 SEN. L.GOV. (Y:2 N:3 A:0)  
05/21/2007 ASM. FLOOR (Y:50 N:13 A:16)  
05/07/2007 ASM. U. & C. (Y:10 N:1 A:1)

**Position:** Support

**Subject:** Eminent Domain,

**AB 938**

**(Calderon, Charles) Regional water management. (A-07/03/2007 [html](#) [pdf](#))**

**Status:** 07/03/2007-Read second time, amended, and re-referred to Com. on E.Q.

[Dead/2YR](#) | [1st Desk](#) | [1st Policy](#) | [1st Fiscal](#) | [1st Floor](#) | [2nd Desk](#) | [2nd Policy](#) | [2nd Fiscal](#) | [2nd Floor](#) | [Conf./Concl.](#) | [Enrolled](#) | [Vetoed](#) | [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** Would authorize a county, or a city under certain circumstances, to convene one or more watershed water quality committees to develop and facilitate cooperation in achieving local water quality solutions. If convened, the committee would be required to include at least one member representing the appropriate regional board, as well as at least one member from entities representing resource agencies, water agencies, sanitation districts, the environmental community, landowners, business, and industry, and, where appropriate, agricultural interests. The committee would be required to prepare a specified work plan for the development of a watershed water quality management plan, for approval by the regional board under specified circumstances. The committee would be required to use reasonable efforts to prepare, and submit to the regional board for its approval, a watershed water quality management plan within 3 years of the date on which the regional board approves the work plan. The

watershed water quality management plan would be required to address major sources of pollutants in stormwater and urban runoff, and other surface runoff pollution within the region to which the plan applies. This bill contains other related provisions.

**Vote Events:**

06/27/2007 SEN. L. GOV. (Y:3 N:1 A:1)  
 06/04/2007 ASM. FLOOR (Y:78 N:0 A:2)  
 05/31/2007 ASM. APPR. (Y:17 N:0 A:0)  
 05/09/2007 ASM. L. GOV. (Y:7 N:0 A:0)  
 04/24/2007 ASM. W., P. & W. (Y:13 N:0 A:0)

**Position:** Staff - support

**Subject:** Stormwater (NPDES),

**AB 1254**

**(Caballero) Property tax revenue allocations: ERAF reduction: affordable housing.** (1-02/23/2007 [html](#) pdf)

**Status:** 06/01/2007-Failed Deadline pursuant to Rule 61(a)(5). Last location was APPR. SUSPENSE FILE

[Dead/2YR](#) | [1st Desk](#) | [1st Policy](#) | [1st Fiscal](#) | [1st Floor](#) | [2nd Desk](#) | [2nd Policy](#) | [2nd Fiscal](#) | [2nd Floor](#) | [Conf./Conc.](#) | [Enrolled](#) | [Vetoed](#) | [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** Would for the 2008-09 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter to the 2014-15 fiscal year, inclusive, require the county auditor to reduce the total amount of ad valorem property tax revenue otherwise required to be allocated to the county ERAF by the countywide affordable housing amount, as defined, and to increase the amount of ad valorem property tax revenue otherwise required to be allocated to a qualified local agency, as defined, by that agency's affordable housing amount. This bill would specify that a qualified local agency's affordable housing amount is equal to the ad valorem property tax revenue lost by the agency as a result of the granting of a specified exemption from property taxes for affordable housing developments for which certificates of occupancy are issued on or after January 1, 2008, as provided. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Vote Events:**

04/11/2007 ASM. L. GOV. (Y:4 N:2 A:1)

**Position:** Support

**Priority:** 1

**Subject:** Housing,

**ACA 8**

**(De La Torre) Eminent domain.** (A-07/10/2007 [html](#) pdf)

**Status:** 07/12/2007-From committee: Be re-referred to Com. on L. GOV. Re-referred. (Ayes 11, Noes 0.) (July 12).

[Dead/2YR](#) | [1st Desk](#) | [1st Policy](#) | [1st Fiscal](#) | [1st Floor](#) | [2nd Desk](#) | [2nd Policy](#) | [2nd Fiscal](#) | [2nd Floor](#) | [Conf./Conc.](#) | [Enrolled](#) | [Vetoed](#) | [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** Would require the public use for which the private property is taken to be stated in writing, prior to the commencement of eminent domain proceedings. This bill contains other existing laws.

**Vote Events:**

07/12/2007 ASM. RLS. (Y:11 N:0 A:0)

07/03/2007 ASM. JUD. (Y:7 N:3 A:0)

**Position:** Support

**Subject:** Eminent Domain,

**SB 33**

**(Simltian) Vehicles: wireless telephones and mobile service devices.** (A-07/12/2007 [html](#) pdf)

**Status:** 07/12/2007-Read third time, Amended. To third reading.

[Dead/2YR](#) | [1st Desk](#) | [1st Policy](#) | [1st Fiscal](#) | [1st Floor](#) | [2nd Desk](#) | [2nd Policy](#) | [2nd Fiscal](#) | [2nd Floor](#) | [Conf./Conc.](#) | [Enrolled](#) | [Vetoed](#) | [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** on and after July 1, 2008, would prohibit a person under the age of 18 years from driving a motor vehicle while using a wireless telephone , even if equipped with a hands-free device , or while using a mobile service device, as defined. The

prohibition would not apply to such a person using a wireless telephone or a mobile service device for emergency purposes. By creating a new infraction, the bill would impose a state-mandated local program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

**Vote Events:**

06/27/2007 ASM. APPR. (Y:14 N:2 A:0)  
 06/11/2007 ASM. TRANS. (Y:13 N:0 A:1)  
 04/26/2007 SEN. FLOOR (Y:21 N:15 A:4)  
 03/27/2007 SEN. T. & H. (Y:8 N:2 A:1)

**Position:** Staff - support

**Priority:** 3

**Subject:** Public Safety,

**SB 279**

**(Yee) State highways; public nuisance. (C-07/20/2007 [html](#) [pdf](#))**

**Status:** 07/20/2007-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 89, Statutes of 2007

[Dead/2YR](#) | [1st Desk](#) | [1st Policy](#) | [1st Fiscal](#) | [1st Floor](#) | [2nd Desk](#) | [2nd Policy](#) | [2nd Fiscal](#) | [2nd Floor](#) | [Conf./Conc](#) | [Enrolled](#) | [Voted](#) | [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** Would provide that peace officers from a local law enforcement agency may enforce these provisions.

**Vote Events:**

07/09/2007 SEN. FLOOR (Y:29 N:7 A:4)  
 06/21/2007 ASM. FLOOR (Y:68 N:7 A:5)  
 06/11/2007 ASM. TRANS. (Y:12 N:0 A:2)  
 04/16/2007 SEN. FLOOR (Y:30 N:5 A:5)  
 03/27/2007 SEN. T. & H. (Y:8 N:1 A:2)

**Position:** Support

**Subject:** Transportation-All,

**SB 286**

**(Lowenthal) Transportation bonds; implementation. (A-07/16/2007 [html](#) [pdf](#))**

**Status:** 07/16/2007-Read second time. Amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

[Dead/2YR](#) | [1st Desk](#) | [1st Policy](#) | [1st Fiscal](#) | [1st Floor](#) | [2nd Desk](#) | [2nd Policy](#) | [2nd Fiscal](#) | [2nd Floor](#) | [Conf./Conc](#) | [Enrolled](#) | [Voted](#) | [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** Would require the first payments of bond funds for local street and road purposes to be allocated by the Controller no later than January 1, 2008. The bill would require the Controller to use the population figures from the Department of Finance as of January 1, 2007, in making allocations to cities. The bill would require an applicant for these funds to submit a list of projects expected to be funded with bond funds to the Department of Finance, as specified, and to report various information to the Department of Finance. The bill would require funds to be encumbered within 3 fiscal years from the date of allocation, and would require unencumbered funds to be returned to the Controller for reallocation. The bill would make other related changes. This bill contains other related provisions.

**Vote Events:**

07/09/2007 ASM. TRANS. (Y:13 N:0 A:1)  
 06/07/2007 SEN. FLOOR (Y:35 N:2 A:3)  
 05/31/2007 SEN. APPR. (Y:16 N:0 A:1)  
 05/21/2007 SEN. APPR. (Y:16 N:0 A:1)  
 04/24/2007 SEN. T. & H. (Y:10 N:1 A:0)

**Position:** Support

**Subject:** Transportation - Other,

**SB 613**

**(Similtian) Local governments: vehicle fee for congestion and stormwater management. (A-04/12/2007 [html](#) [pdf](#))**

Status: 06/27/2007-Read second time. To third reading.

[Dead/2YR](#) [1st Desk](#) [1st Policy](#) [1st Fiscal](#) [1st Floor](#) [2nd Desk](#) [2nd Policy](#) [2nd Fiscal](#) [2nd Floor](#) [Conf/Conc](#) [Enrolled](#) [Vetoed](#) [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** Would provide that the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County may reauthorize that fee for a period of 10 years until January 1, 2019 , as specified .

**Vote Events:**

06/25/2007 ASM. TRANS. (Y:8 N:3 A:3)  
 06/13/2007 ASM. L. GOV. (Y:5 N:2 A:0)  
 04/16/2007 SEN. FLOOR (Y:21 N:15 A:4)  
 04/10/2007 SEN. T. & H. (Y:6 N:4 A:1)

**Position:** Sponsor

**Priority:** 1

**Subject:** Transportation-All, Stormwater (NPDES),

SCA 12

(Torlakson) Local government: property-related fees. (A-06/18/2007 [html](#) [pdf](#))

Status: 07/12/2007-Read second time. To third reading.

[Dead/2YR](#) [1st Desk](#) [1st Policy](#) [1st Fiscal](#) [1st Floor](#) [2nd Desk](#) [2nd Policy](#) [2nd Fiscal](#) [2nd Floor](#) [Conf/Conc](#) [Enrolled](#) [Vetoed](#) [Chaptered](#)

**Summary:** Would additionally exclude fees and charges for stormwater and urban runoff management from these approval requirements for the imposition or increase of a property-related fee or charge.

**Vote Events:**

07/10/2007 SEN. E., R. & C.A. (Y:3 N:2 A:0)  
 06/27/2007 SEN. L.GOV. (Y:3 N:1 A:1)

**Position:** Support

**Subject:** Stormwater (NPDES),

Total rows: 12

## c/cag net metering

AB 1223

(Arambula) Public utilities: net energy metering.

Status: 07/03/2007-In committee: Set, first hearing. Hearing canceled at the request of author.

Dead/2YR 1st Desk 1st Policy 1st Fiscal 1st Floor 2nd Desk 2nd Policy 2nd Fiscal 2nd Floor Conf/Conc Enrolled Vetted Chaptered

Summary: Would require that, for the purposes of determining whether an agricultural customer-generator using wind or solar electric generation was a net consumer or a net producer of electricity during a 12-month period, the electrical corporation shall aggregate the electrical load of the agricultural customer under the same ownership located on property adjacent or contiguous to the generation facility. The bill would further require that each aggregated account be billed and measured according to a time-of-use rate schedule.

AB 1714

(Levine) Energy: solar energy systems.

Status: 06/07/2007-Chaptered by Secretary of State - Res. Chapter 11, Statutes of 2007.

Dead/2YR 1st Desk 1st Policy 1st Fiscal 1st Floor 2nd Desk 2nd Policy 2nd Fiscal 2nd Floor Conf/Conc Enrolled Vetted Chaptered

Summary: Would authorize the PUC to delay implementation of time-variant pricing for ratepayers with a solar energy system, until the effective date of the rates established in the next general rate case of the state's 3 largest electrical corporations. If the commission delays implementation of time-variant pricing, the bill would require that ratepayers required to take service under time-variant pricing between January 1, 2007, and January 1, 2008, and that would otherwise qualify for flat rate pricing, be given the option to take service under flat rate or time-variant pricing. This bill contains other related provisions.

AJR 3

(Dymally) Low-income home energy assistance.

Status: 02/01/2007-Referred to Com. on U. &amp; C.

Dead/2YR 1st Desk 1st Policy 1st Fiscal 1st Floor 2nd Desk 2nd Policy 2nd Fiscal 2nd Floor Conf/Conc Enrolled Vetted Chaptered

Summary: Would memorialize the President and the Congress to increase the federal budget authorization for the federal Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program to \$7,000,000,000 for the 2007-08 fiscal year, and appropriate that entire amount for distribution to the states.

SB 451

(Kehoe) Energy: renewable energy resource customer-generators.

Status: 07/16/2007-Read second time. Amended. Re-referred to Com. on APPR.

Dead/2YR 1st Desk 1st Policy 1st Fiscal 1st Floor 2nd Desk 2nd Policy 2nd Fiscal 2nd Floor Conf/Conc Enrolled Vetted Chaptered

Summary: Would instead require every electrical corporation to make the tariff available to any customer of the electrical corporation, upon request, on a first-come-first-served basis, until the electrical corporation meets its proportionate share of a combined statewide cumulative rated generating capacity of those electric generation facilities of 1,000 megawatts. The bill would provide that the electricity generated by an electric generation facility counts toward the electrical corporation's renewables portfolio standard and resource adequacy requirements. The bill would delete an existing requirement that the electric generation facility be sized to offset part or all of the generator's electricity demand. The bill would authorize a customer receiving electrical

service pursuant to an alternative net metering program, as defined, to elect to receive service pursuant to the tariff filed by an electrical corporation pursuant to the bill's requirements and would provide that a customer electing to receive service pursuant to the tariff waives any right the customer otherwise has to thereafter receive service pursuant to an alternative net metering program. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

SB 1040

(Committee on Energy, Utilities and Communications) Public utilities.

Status: 07/12/2007-From Consent Calendar to third reading.

Dead/2YR	1st Desk	1st Policy	1st Fiscal	1st Floor	2nd Desk	2nd Policy	2nd Fiscal	2nd Floor	Conf /Conc	Enrolled	Voted	Chaptered
----------	----------	------------	------------	-----------	----------	------------	------------	-----------	------------	----------	-------	-----------

Summary: Would provide that the definitions contained in the act govern the construction of the code unless the provision or context otherwise requires. The bill would define the term "Energy Commission" as meaning the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission for purposes of the code, and would define the term "local publicly owned electric utility" within the act. This bill contains other related provisions and other existing laws.

Total rows: 5

## **SB 279 List of Supporters**

City of Millbrae (source)  
American Federation of State, County and Municipal  
Employees  
California State Association of Counties  
California State Sheriffs' Association  
Chapel of the Highlands  
City of Belmont  
City of Burlingame  
City of San Bruno  
City of San Mateo  
City of South San Francisco  
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County  
County of Los Angeles  
County of Los Angeles Sheriff's Department  
Millbrae Chamber of Commerce  
Millbrae Police Department  
Millbrae Senior Advisory Committee  
Palo Alto Police Department  
San Bruno Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee  
San Bruno Police Department  
San Mateo County Transit District  
Zen Peninsula Chinese Restaurant

**Congratulations and Thanks for all your support!!**



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** C/CAG Board of Directors

**From:** Richard Napier

**Subject:** Review and approval of Resolution 07-26 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amended Fiscal Year 2007-08 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Expenditure Program (\$41,000) for the City of Menlo Park for local shuttle service.

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

---

## RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board review and approve Resolution 07-26 authorizing the C/CAG Chair to execute an amended Fiscal Year 2007-08 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Expenditure Program (\$41,000) for the City of Menlo Park for local shuttle service.

## FISCAL IMPACT

The revised Expenditure Program only relates to the \$41,000 Menlo Park shuttle project.

## SOURCE OF FUNDS

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) is authorized under Health and Safety code Section 44223 and 44225 to levy a fee on motor vehicles. Funds generated by the fee are referred to as the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds and are used to implement projects to reduce air pollution from motor vehicles. Health and Safety Code Section 44241(d) stipulates that forty percent (40%) of funds generated within a county where the fee is in effect shall be allocated by the Air District to one or more public agencies designated to receive the funds, and for San Mateo County, C/CAG has been designated as the overall Program Manager to receive the funds.

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the April 12, 2007 C/CAG Board of Directors meeting the Board approved the FY 2007/2008 Expenditure Program for the TFCA Program. One of the approved projects was the Menlo Park Midday Shuttle. As part of the TFCA Program, project sponsors must complete cost effectiveness worksheets that calculate the cost of particulate matter removal. The cost effectiveness must be less than \$90,000 per ton in order for eligible projects to be approved by the Air District.

Staff learned from the Air District that there was an error in the worksheet and the originally

**ITEM 4.12**

submitted project did not make the \$90,000 per ton threshold. After working with Menlo Park, staff is recommending that we resubmit another Menlo Park shuttle project that does appear to be less than the required cost effectiveness of \$90,000 per ton. The originally approved amount for the Menlo Park Midday Shuttle was \$41,000 for FY 2007/2008. The revised expenditure program will be for a \$41,000 Menlo Park shuttle project.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Resolution 07-26

## **RESOLUTION 07-26**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE  
CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO  
COUNTY AUTHORIZING THE C/CAG CHAIR TO EXECUTE AN AMENDED  
FISCAL YEAR 2007-08 TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA)  
EXPENDITURE PROGRAM (\$41,000) FOR THE CITY OF MENLO PARK FOR  
LOCAL SHUTTLE SERVICE**

**WHEREAS**, the City/County Association of Governments has been designated the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager for San Mateo County; and,

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments has approved certain projects and programs for funding through San Mateo County's 40 percent local share of Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) revenues; and,

**WHEREAS**, the City/County Association of Governments will act as the Program Manager for approximately \$1,029,000, of TFCA funded projects; and,

**WHEREAS**, the approximate \$1,029,000 funding is to be adjusted to the actual amount when it becomes available, and to be incorporated into individual contracts; and,

**WHEREAS**, C/CAG desires to revise the originally submitted Expenditure Program with a new Menlo Park local shuttle service project; and

**WHEREAS**, the projects included in this expenditure program are the most appropriate and cost-effective strategies currently available within the County for reducing motor vehicle emissions. All proposed expenditures will be consistent with the *Clean Air Plan* and Section 44241(b) of the California Health and Safety Code;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of Directors of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County that the C/CAG Staff is authorized to submit the revised 2007-08 Expenditure Program for the San Mateo County TFCA Program to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

**PASSED, APPROVED, AND ADOPTED THIS 9<sup>th</sup> DAY OF AUGUST 2007.**

---

Deborah C. Gordon, C/CAG Chair



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007  
**To:** City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors  
**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director  
**Subject:** Review and Approval of Appointments to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC)

(For further information or questions contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board consider appointments of Mr. Ron Popp, Mr. Syed Murtuza, and Mr. Bob Beyer to fill the vacant seats on the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC).

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) is made up of engineers and planners and provides technical expertise for both the CMEQ and the C/CAG Board. There are currently a total of 25 positions including 15 engineers and 4 planners from the local jurisdictions in addition to representatives from Caltrans, SamTrans, Peninsula Corridor JPB, SMCTA, MTC, and C/CAG.

There are currently three vacancies on the CMP TAC, two (2) engineering positions and one (1) planning position. The vacancies are due to the following:

- Mr. George Bagdon, City of Burlingame Engineering – Retired
- Mr. Fernando Bravo, City of East Palo Alto Engineering – No longer with City
- Ms. Liz Cullinan, City of San Carlos Planning – No longer with City

To fill the vacant engineering positions, staff solicited individuals from C/CAG member agencies who have expressed interest in being on the TAC and requested that a letter of interest be submitted to C/CAG for considerations. The three (3) individuals recommended by their respective agencies to serve on the TAC are as follows:

- Mr. Ron Popp, City of Millbrae Engineering
- Mr. Syed Murtuza, City of Burlingame Engineering

**ITEM 4.13**

- Mr. Bob Beyer, City of San Mateo Planning

The appointments of the two engineering candidates and one planning candidate to vacant positions will completely backfill the TAC vacancies.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Current roster for the CMP TAC
- Letter from City of Millbrae
- Letter from City of Burlingame
- Letter from City of San Mateo

### Current CMP TAC Roster - 2007

Member	Agency
Ian McAvoy (Co-Chair)	SamTrans
Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering
April Chan	Peninsula Corridor JPB
Duncan Jones	Atherton Engineering
Gene Gonzalo	CalTrans
<b>Vacant</b>	
Jon Lynch	Redwood City Engineering
Joseph Hurley	SMCTA
K. Folan	MTC
Larry Patterson	San Mateo City Engineering
<b>Vacant</b>	
Mark Duino	San Mateo County Planning
Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning
Mo Sharma	Daly City Engineering
Parviz Mokhtari	San Carlos Engineering
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering
Ray Davis	Belmont Engineering
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering
Reza (Ray) M. Razavi	South San Francisco Engineering
Rick Mao	Colma Engineering
Ruben Nino	Menlo Park Engineering
Sandy Wong	C/CAG CMP
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering
<b>Vacant</b>	



*City of Millbrae*  
621 Magnolia Avenue, Millbrae, CA 94030

MARC HERSHMAN  
Mayor

NADIA V. HOLOBER  
Vice Mayor

LINDA T. LARSON  
Councilwoman

GINA PAPAN  
Councilwoman

ROBERT G. GOTTSCHALK  
Councilman

MARY VELLA TRESELER  
Treasurer

June 1, 2007

City/County of Governments (C/CAG)  
Of San Mateo County  
Richard Napier, Executive Director  
555 County Center, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Redwood City, CA 94063

Subject: Nomination for the C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

It is with great enthusiasm and pride that I nominate Ronnald Popp, the City of Millbrae's Public Works Director, to become a board member of the C/CAG TAC. Ron has been with the City for 9 years and understands San Mateo County regional needs and challenges well. He has a great deal of experience with long range and critical path repair and infrastructure planning. He is practical, fair, experienced, and would be very adept at balancing regional needs among all municipalities in the County.

We strongly recommend him for an appointment to the TAC board and appreciate the opportunity to do so. We believe the other members of the board would welcome his can do attitude, energy and willingness to tackle the dirty work.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ralph L. Jaeck".

Ralph L. Jaeck  
City Manager

City Council/City Manager  
(650) 259-2334

Personnel  
(650) 259-2334

City Clerk  
(650) 259-2334

Finance/Water  
(650) 259-2350

Public Works/Engineering  
(650) 259-2339

Community Development  
(650) 259-2341

Recreation  
(650) 259-2360

Building Division  
(650) 259-2330

Police Department  
(650) 259-2300

Fire Department  
(650) 259-2400



Syed



## *The City of Burlingame*

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT  
TEL: (650) 558-7230  
FAX: (650) 685-9310

CITY HALL - 501 PRIMROSE ROAD  
BURLINGAME, CALIFORNIA 94010-3997

CORPORATION YARD  
(650) 558-7670

July 11, 2007

C/CAG Board of Directors  
Mr. Richard Napier  
Director  
555 County Center  
Redwood City, Ca. 94063

Dear Members of the Board,

The Burlingame City Council would like to recommend the new Public Works Director, Syed Murtuza, to replace George Bagdon on the C/CAG TAC. After 16 years with Burlingame, George will be retiring in August.

Syed has 10 years of service with Burlingame as the Assistant Director and is very familiar with the issues facing C/CAG TAC.

Sincerely yours,

Terry Nagel  
Mayor  
City of Burlingame



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**DATE:** August 9, 2007

**TO:** City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors

**FROM:** Richard Napier, Executive Director

**SUBJECT:** Receive presentation and comments on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Strategic Plan Process

(For further information contact Richard Napier at 599-1420)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

Receive presentation and comments on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) Strategic Plan Process.

## **BACKGROUND/ DISCUSSION:**

Implementation guidelines in the 2004 Transportation Expenditure Plan approved in connection with Measure A by the voters of San Mateo County on November 2, 2004 require the Transportation Authority to prepare a Strategic Plan prior to January 1, 2009. The Strategic Plan will identify funding prioritization criteria consistent with the goals and objectives of the Countywide Transportation Plan and the Transportation Expenditure Plan. The Strategic Plan will be updated at least every five years during the term of the Measure.

Presentations have been made and comments provided by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) and the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ).

The Transportation Authority staff will provide a presentation and update on the Strategic Plan Process at the C/CAG Board meeting.

**ITEM 5.1**



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** City/County Association of Governments Board of Directors

**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director

**Subject:** Review and Approval of the 2007 congestion monitoring report and the Draft 2007 Congestion Management Program (CMP) and authorize distribution for comments

(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board approves the 2007 congestion monitoring report and the Draft 2007 Congestion Management Program (CMP) and authorizes distribution for comments

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

It is not anticipated that the changes in the 2007 document will result in any increase in the current fiscal commitment that C/CAG has made to the Program.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Every two years, C/CAG as the Congestion Management Agency for San Mateo County, is required to prepare and adopt a Congestion Management Program (CMP). C/CAG is also required to measure the roadway segments and intersections on the Congestion Management Program roadway network to determine the change in LOS from one period to the next. This is a report card on whether the roadway system is improving or getting worse.

As part of the 2007 CMP update, C/CAG has retained Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants to monitor the roadway segments and intersections on the Congestion Management Program roadway network. As a result of this monitoring, C/CAG is required to determine what location(s), if any, has(have) exceeded the LOS standard that was established by C/CAG in 1991. Deficient locations are determined after deducting the traffic attributable to:

- Interregional travel.
- Construction, rehabilitation, or maintenance of facilities that impact the system.
- Freeway ramp metering.
- Traffic signal coordination by the state or multi-jurisdictional agencies.
- Traffic generated by the provision of low-income and very low income housing.
- Traffic generated by high-density residential development or mixed-use development (half of the mixed use development must be used for high density residential) within one-fourth

**ITEM 5.2**

mile of a fixed rail passenger station.

If, after applying the above exclusions, a deficient location is identified, the C/CAG Travel Demand Forecasting Model is used to determine the origins of the traffic at the deficient locations to determine which jurisdictions must participate in the development of a deficiency plan. A jurisdiction must participate if the traffic it is contributing is greater than ten percent (10%) of the capacity of the deficient location. On February 14, 2002, C/CAG adopted the San Mateo County Congestion Relief Plan that fulfills the requirement of a Countywide Deficiency Plan for all roadway segment and intersection deficiencies identified through the monitoring done for the 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, and 2007 Congestion Management Programs. In February 2007, the Congestion Relief Plan was reauthorized for an additional four years. Therefore no jurisdiction will be required to develop a deficiency plan as a result of this monitoring report.

### **2007 Traffic Monitoring Analysis**

Based on the monitoring report and after the exclusions for interregional traffic has been applied, two of the 53 roadway segments exceeded the LOS standard. This compares with one deficient segment in 1997 and eight deficient segments in 1999, nine deficient segments in 2001 and four deficient segments in 2003, and five deficient segments in 2005.

It is noted that reductions for the 2001 through 2005 CMP Monitoring Reports were based on the 2000 C/CAG travel demand forecasting model's estimations. For the 2007 Monitoring Report, the reductions were updated based on the updated 2005 C/CAG travel demand forecasting model.

The complete Monitoring Report is included in Appendix F of the Draft Congestion Management Program for 2007. The two roadway segments in violation of the LOS Standard in 2007 are:

- SR 1, San Francisco County Line to Linda Mar Boulevard
- SR 84, Willow Street to University Avenue

For the sixteen intersections monitored, the 2007 traffic volumes, lane configurations, and signal phasings were used as inputs to the intersection level of service calculations. No reductions for inter-regional travel were applied to the intersection volumes. There were no LOS standard violations for intersections in 2007.

In 2005, in addition to utilizing the Circular 212 methodology, the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (2000 HCM) was also used in parallel to calculate a second set of LOS results. The 2007 Monitoring Report continued to utilize both methods, however, the results obtained from the 2000 HCM were used to compare changes in LOS.

In general, the following are some observations from the data contained in the report. These observations are based on the total traffic. The exclusions for determining deficiencies are not considered in these observations.

- From 1997 to 1999 there was an increase in traffic at 24 locations and a decrease at 18 locations.

- From 1999 to 2001 there was an increase in traffic at 13 locations and a decrease at 14 locations.
- From 2001 to 2003 there was an increase in traffic at 6 locations and a decrease at 19 locations.
- From 2003 to 2005 there was an increase in traffic at 17 locations and a decrease at 11 locations.
- From 2005 to 2007 there was an increase in traffic at 15 locations and a decrease at 11 locations.
- From 1997 to 2007 there was an increase in traffic at 36 locations and a decrease at 14 locations.
- The number of LOS F (F designated the worse possible congestion) roadway segments has gone from 6 in 1995, to 8 in 1997, to 18 in 1999, to 16 in 2001, to 13 in 2003, to 12 in 2005, to 14 in 2007.
- The number of LOS F intersections has gone from 4 in 1995, to 4 in 1997, to 3 in 1999, to 1 in 2001, to none in 2003 and 2005, to 2 in 2007. The majority of intersections that were monitored were along Route 82 (El Camino Real).

Travel times were also measured for the U.S. 101 corridor between the San Francisco and Santa Clara County Lines. The U.S. 101 corridor was selected because, in addition to mixed-flow lanes, it includes High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes, bus routes, and passenger rail. Results are summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3																
Average Travel Time in U.S. 101 Corridor (in minutes) <sup>1</sup>																
Mode	AM <sup>2</sup>								PM <sup>3</sup>							
	Northbound				Southbound				Northbound				Southbound			
	2007	2005	2003	2001	2007	2005	2003	2001	2007	2005	2003	2001	2007	2005	2003	2001
Single-Occupant Auto	26	31	29	27	35	38	37	49	33	33	39	31	30	35	30	26
Carpool	26	30	28	25	31	31	29	38	31	32	34	31	29	32	25	25
Caltrain (Local & express)	35	42	43	44	34	42	49	48	38	42	49	49	34	42	46	45
SamTrans Route KX	75	72	68	66	78	72	74	76	80	79	75	75	81	75	72	71
Notes:																
<sup>1</sup> Between San Francisco and Santa Clara County Lines.																
<sup>2</sup> Morning commute period.																
<sup>3</sup> Evening commute period.																

Travel time surveys were also conducted for the HOV lanes on U.S. 101, which currently extend from the Santa Clara County Line to Whipple Avenue. The total travel time for carpools was estimated by adding the travel time in the HOV lanes between the Santa Clara County Line and Whipple Avenue to the travel time in the mixed-flow lanes between Whipple Avenue and the San Francisco County Line.

Travel times for bus and passenger rail modes were estimated based on SamTrans and Caltrain published schedules. SamTrans bus route KX operates in the U.S. 101 corridor. This route

provides service through San Mateo County from San Francisco to Palo Alto. Travel times were based on the average travel time between County lines during the commute hours. Travel time via Caltrain was calculated in a similar manner.

### **ATTACHMENT**

1. Draft Congestion Management Program (CMP) for 2007 for San Mateo County  
*(Provided to Board members only. Public members may contact John Hoang at 650-363-4105 if interested in receiving the document.)*



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** August 9, 2007

**To:** C/CAG Board of Directors

**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director

**Subject:** Review and accept the Final Report on the San Mateo County Housing Needs Study.

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

---

## RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Board of Directors review and accept the Final Report on the San Mateo County Housing Needs Study in accordance with staff recommendation.

## FISCAL IMPACT

None.

## SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funding for the Housing Needs Study is derived from the Congestion Relief Program and two grants.

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Housing Needs Study was distributed for comments in draft format to all the cities and the County as well as presented to the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee and the C/CAG Board of Directors. Staff received comments from the CMEQ Committee as well as from the Peninsula Interfaith Action (PIA) organization.

The Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee received a presentation on the Housing Needs Study and had the following comments.

- Build not only units, but units for the right people.
- There is a mapping mistake on page 6 of the report, which left out East Palo Alto.
- When presenting the numbers that represent the future, it should always state that it's a projection.
- Use the same color to represent the same thing on different charts.
- There is no need to advocate for high-end housing, but the lower ends.

**ITEM 5.3**

- We need a plan to bridge the housing gap.
- We must address housing and transportation together.
- The topic of Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is missing.
- Show more statistics such as household and income for each jurisdiction.
- Show actual housing production numbers in the past 10 years.

The Peninsula Interfaith Action (PIA) also provided the following comment on the Housing Needs Study.

- Determining the affordability gap

The study uses grouped categories by income, applying calculations to the top end of that range. Therefore the quantification of affordability gaps in the study understates the severity of the problem for many San Mateo County families. PIA wants the fact that this methodology creates conservative estimates underscored.

The remaining PIA comments were not pertinent to the Housing Needs Study. They were focused on the next steps or possible policy options.

The figures in the report were updated where necessary to reflect that they were projections. Figures were also updated so that the colors were coordinated throughout the document. Table S-2 was also added to the report to provide the figures for the last ten years of housing production by jurisdiction.

The report now reflects the fact that the affordability gap estimates provided were conservative. Transit Oriented Development was also mentioned as a possible source of future housing that could reduce the reliance of new growth on the County's roads. Language was also added to acknowledge that the industry standard for financially feasible fee burdens on nonresidential development is between 5%-10%.

Attached please see the Final Report on the San Mateo County Housing Needs Study.

### ALTERNATIVES

- 1) Review and accept the Final Report on the San Mateo County Housing Needs Study in accordance with staff recommendation.
- 2) Review and accept the Final Report on the San Mateo County Housing Needs Study in accordance with staff recommendation with modifications.
- 3) No action

### ATTACHMENTS

- Final Report on the San Mateo County Housing Needs Study

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

DATE: August 9, 2007

TO: C/CAG Board of Directors

FROM: Tom Kasten

SUBJECT: Executive Director Compensation and Evaluation

Dear Board Colleagues:

I won't be at the C/CAG meeting because I will be out of town. Consequently, I want to provide this information to you. As you recall, we have changed our approach to evaluation and compensation of the C/CAG Executive Director. A few months ago, you approved a new compensation plan which combines both a salary and a bonus based on performance and achievement. Our Executive Director now has the opportunity to earn a bonus up to 10% of his salary depending on his level of performance and results during the year.

You approved a new Evaluation Form which is consistent with the new compensation approach and which lists the major objectives and appropriate measures to use.

You then tasked our subcommittee with:

- Revising the evaluation forms to make them consistent with the new compensation policy.
- Simplifying the forms.
- Ensuring that the Board evaluates dimensions based on what we can observe.

Enclosed are the revised evaluation forms. The first one reflects the objectives that we approved in consort with the Executive Director for this fiscal year, including the measures to be used to gauge performance. The second form is a shortened version of the checklist that has been used in the past.

I would like to highlight a few changes:

- We have moved from a 5 point scale to a rating system that evaluates whether the ED "Meets, Exceeds or Does not meet" the objective. We carried that same rating scale over to the checklist.
- We reduced the number of dimensions and behavioral characteristics on the checklist to include only those that we are in a position to observe and evaluate.
- We eliminated the redundancies and overlaps.
- We've added some qualitative questions to summarize what the ED does well and what areas may need attention.


It is very important that Board members take the time to evaluate the ED's performance. The "comment" section is crucial to the overall evaluation and will have an impact on the bonus calculation. We are asking each board member to explain the reason for their "Exceeds" or "Does not Meet" ratings in order to capture performance fairly and to give the ED sufficient information to understand the rankings.

We think this evaluation approach will be easier for us to complete and be more useful to the ED.

**ITEM 5.4**

I would also like to recognize and thank my colleagues on the subcommittee – Carole Groom, Diane Howard, Irene O'Connell and Rosalie O'Mahony - for their dedication and contributions to our effort. I also want to thank Arne Croce, the San Mateo City Manager, who has been instrumental throughout the process to improve the compensation and evaluation processes.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Tom Kasten". The signature is written in dark ink and has a long, horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Tom Kasten

**DRAFT  
C/CAG EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
EVALUATION**

	<u>Exceeds Expectation</u>	<u>Meets Expectation</u>	<u>Does not meet Expectation</u>
<b>COMMUNICATIONS:</b>			
Does the Executive Director keep you informed of the things you want to know about in a timely manner?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
Do reports provide adequate information and analysis?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
Are agenda items, reports and supporting documents adequate and appropriate to help you make sound decisions?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
Is information brought to the Board in sufficient time for deliberations?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
Does the Executive Director follow up promptly on Board requests for information or action?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
Do you feel she/he is a good listener?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
Are Executive Director communications thoughtful, clear and to the point?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
Is the Executive Director open to new ideas and suggestions for change?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
_____			

	<u>Exceeds Expectation</u>	<u>Meets Expectation</u>	<u>Does not meet Expectation</u>
Was the Executive Director responsive to Board Policy and direction?			

---



---



---

Does the Executive Director show initiative and creativity in dealing with issues, problems and unusual situations?			
---	--	--	--

---



---



---

**FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT:**

Are you satisfied with the Executive Director's approach to budget preparation and review?			
--	--	--	--

---



---



---

Is the proposed budget submitted on time with sufficient information to enable you to make an informed decision?			
--	--	--	--

---



---



---

Are you provided status updates during the term of service contracts?			
---	--	--	--

---



---



---

Does the Executive Director make suggestions for cost savings?			
--	--	--	--

---



---



---

**AGENCY AND MEDIA RELATIONS:**

Does the Executive Director make a positive impression on citizens and is she/he respected in San Mateo County? Does the staff?			
--	--	--	--

---



---



---

How effectively does the Executive Director work with the staffs of member agencies in coordinating their interests with C/CAG activities?			
--	--	--	--

---



---



---

	<u>Exceeds Expectation</u>	<u>Meets Expectation</u>	<u>Does not meet Expectation</u>
Does the Executive Director effectively represent C/CAG's interests with other agencies?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
Is the Executive Director successful in guiding staff and contracting agencies so that they work together as a team toward common objectives?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			
Does C/CAG garner sufficient coverage in the press of its accomplishments?	_____	_____	_____
_____			
_____			

#### **SUMMARY PERFORMANCE:**

What is the Executive Director doing that you would like continued?

---



---



---

What is the Executive Director doing that you would like stopped or changed?

---



---



---

What is the Executive Director not doing that you would like started?

---



---



---

Please list the 3 priority areas of focus for next year for the Executive Director.

---



---



---

**OVERALL PERFORMANCE:**

- ☐ EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS
- ☐ MEETS EXPECTATIONS
- ☐ DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Board Member:

(Please print)

Agency:

Signature:

Date:



**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
DRAFT PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES  
2006-07**

**C/CAG FINANCIAL OPERATIONS**

- 1- Objective - Manage all individual funds such that the actual ending balance (total, including reserves) for each fund as of the June 30, 2007 closing for FY 06-07 is either balanced or in a positive position.

Measure - Actual ending balance (total including reserves) for each fund as of the June 30, 2007 closing for FY 06-07 is either balanced or in a positive position.

☐ **Exceeds Objectives**    ☐ **Meets Objectives**    ☐ **Doesn't Meet Objectives**

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

- 2- Objective - Pursue and bring in commitments for additional revenue (from new or expansion of current State/ Federal/ Local sources) to C/CAG of \$250,000 and to San Mateo County Agencies of \$1M.

Measure - Total amount of additional revenue (from new or expansion of current State/ Federal/ Local sources) to C/CAG and to San Mateo County Agencies.

☐ **Exceeds Objectives**    ☐ **Meets Objectives**    ☐ **Doesn't Meet Objectives**

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

- 3- Objective - Develop a clear and concise balanced FY 07-08 budget for Board Approval by June 30, 2007 and manage the FY 06-07 budget so that at the end of the fiscal year (June 30, 2007), the projected actual budget is either balanced or in a positive position.

Measure - Board adoption of the FY 07-08 Budget by June 30, 2007 and the FY 06-07 projected actual Budget is either balanced or in a positive position.

☐ **Exceeds Objectives**    ☐ **Meets Objectives**    ☐ **Doesn't Meet Objectives**

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

## C/CAG OPERATIONS

- 1- Objective - Provide timely support and representation for San Mateo County agencies to maximize transportation funds and to reduce the loss to the County of funds at risk.

Measure - Qualitative and to the extent practical quantify and specify the significant responses. Specify the amount of funds at risk to be lost by an agency that was addressed such that the funds stayed in San Mateo County and actions taken to provide additional funds.

☐ Exceeds Objectives    ☐ Meets Objectives    ☐ Doesn't Meet Objectives

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

- 2- Objective - Provide leadership for staff development, prompt replacement of staff, and conduct performance evaluations and compensation decisions for C/CAG staff by March for Administrative Assistant and May for Transportation Systems Coordinators.

Measure - Specify actions and date completed.

☐ Exceeds Objectives    ☐ Meets Objectives    ☐ Doesn't Meet Objectives

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

- 3- Objective - Provide quality support and representation to the satisfaction of the Board.

☐ Exceeds Objectives    ☐ Meets Objectives    ☐ Doesn't Meet Objectives

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

- 4- Objective - Represent the Board and C/CAG at the regional (MTC, Caltrans, BAAQMD, RWQCB) and State (CTC, Legislature) Levels.

Measure - Number of meetings attended and presentations provided to each agency. Define the agency, topic and number of meetings.

☐ Exceeds Objectives    ☐ Meets Objectives    ☐ Doesn't Meet Objectives

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

- 5- Objective - Manage, monitor, and represent to the appropriate State body the C/CAG Board legislative agenda.

Measure - Board approved legislative priorities. Number of legislative meetings. Results achieved on the Boards high priority issues.

- 6- Objective - Generate Annual Report for C/CAG to be distributed no later than August.

Measure - Annual Report generated and date distributed.

☐ Exceeds Objectives    ☐ Meets Objectives    ☐ Doesn't Meet Objectives

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

#### **C/CAG CRITICAL PROGRAMS**

- 1- Objective - Work with TA, Caltrans, MTC, and CTC staffs to provide the additional State funding needed (if any) by Feb 07 for the Highway 101 Third to Millbrae Auxiliary Lane Project such that it can be awarded by 3/07.

Measure - Additional State funding (if any) voted by the CTC by Feb 07.

☐ Exceeds Objectives    ☐ Meets Objectives    ☐ Doesn't Meet Objectives

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

- 2- Objective - Bring in \$300,000 FAA Grant for updating the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) for San Francisco International Airport.

Measure - Grant received and amount funded.

☐ Exceeds Objectives    ☐ Meets Objectives    ☐ Doesn't Meet Objectives

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

---

- 3- Objective - Congestion Relief Plan Reauthorized by June 30, 2007 for a minimum of \$1.3 M from the cities and the County.

Measure - Board approval of new Congestion Relief Program by June 30, 2007.

☐ **Exceeds Objectives**    ☐ **Meets Objectives**    ☐ **Doesn't Meet Objectives**

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

- 4- Objective - Ramp metering implementation by 3/30/07.

Measure - Ramp metering turned on by 3/30/07.

☐ **Exceeds Objectives**    ☐ **Meets Objectives**    ☐ **Doesn't Meet Objectives**

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

- 5- Objective - Establish a sub region for San Mateo County for dealing with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and meet the FY 06-07 milestones which include: Subregional RHNA organization/ process 9/06, Subregional methodology (Initial 12/06 and Final 3/07), and Draft RHNA by 6/07.

Measure - Number of resolutions adopted to participate in a sub-region for San Mateo County and milestones met in FY 06-07.

☐ **Exceeds Objectives**    ☐ **Meets Objectives**    ☐ **Doesn't Meet Objectives**

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---

- 6- Objective - Pursue NPDES funding options thru legislation.

Measure - Quantify vehicle and funds provided.

☐ **Exceeds Objectives**    ☐ **Meets Objectives**    ☐ **Doesn't Meet Objectives**

Please explain ratings at either end of spectrum:

---

---

---